Columbia University
in the City of New York
THE LIBRARIES

Bequest of
Frederic Bancroft
1860-1945

WORKS OF

THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN ENGLAND

THE WORKS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND

JOHN ENGLAND

FIRST BISHOP OF CHARLESTON

Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Index
under the direction of

THE MOST REVEREND SEBASTIAN G. MESSMER
Archbishop of Milwaukee

With Portraits

VOLUME II

Cleveland, Ohio
The Arthur H. Clark Company
1903

F36
E34
v.2

COPYRIGHT 1908, BY

THE ARTHUR H. CLARK COMPANY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II

PART I. DOCTRINE [CONCLUDED].

DEFENCE OF "A PROTESTANT CATECHISM." [*Concluded from Volume I.*] 9

PART II. CONTROVERSY.

JUDICIAL OFFICE OF THE CHURCH. 171

THE VICIOUS CIRCLE. 210

CALUMNIES OF J. BLANCO WHITE. 213

PART I

DOCTRINE

(Concluded from Volume I)

LETTER III.

Ye seraphs, who God's throne encircling still,
With holy zeal your golden censers fill;
Ye flaming ministers, to distant lands
Who bear, obsequious, his divine commands;
Ye cherubs, who compose the sacred choir,
Attuning to the voice th' angelic lyre!
Or ye, fair natives of the heavenly plain,
Who once were mortal—now a happier train!
Who spend in peaceful love your joyful hours,
In blissful meads, and amaranthine bowers,
Oh, lend one spark of your celestial fire,
And deign my glowing bosom to inspire,
And aid the Muse's inexperienced wing,
While Goodness, theme divine, she soars to sing.

Boyse.

CHARLESTON, S. C., June 15, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—I now proceed to show that your correspondent "Protestant Catholic" is not only inconsistent with the tenets of your church, but that he has altogether failed in sustaining his first charge against me.

He stated that Roman Catholics called upon the angels and saints in the same way that they did upon God, to be merciful to them, and this ground has been removed, because of the untruth of the statement. His next averment is that Roman Catholics "pray to angels and saints to save them by their merits." And here he assumes two grounds for their condemnation: first, that it is idolatry to pray to the blessed spirits, next, that we dishonour Christ when we ask to be saved by the merits of such beings. I shall take each topic separately.

In paragraph 10, he lays down his principle: "And what is prayer offered to a creature, whether visible or invisible, if not idolatry?" If by prayer he meant the homage which is due only to God, by which we ask of him as the sole fountain of grace and mercy, that which he alone can effectually bestow, I answer distinctly, to offer such prayer to any creature would be idolatry. But it is untrue that Roman Catholics do offer any such homage to any creature, and until your correspondent shall have proved that they do, he will not have laid any ground for

the application of his principle: my assertion is that he has not shown, and cannot show that such prayer is so offered.

But the word prayer, frequently signifies a "request," "an intreaty made by one creature to another, for such aid as that creature can bestow," and in this sense I submit that prayer might be lawfully made by a human being, not only to his fellow-man, but to any other creature that can aid him.—To make application for such aid to one who could not hear, or who hearing, could not help, might be folly; but it would not be idolatry. If prayer of this latter kind be offered to angels and saints, I assert it is not idolatry.

To say that no distinction can be made by the suppliant who addresses a principal from whom alone the favour must come, and an intercessor who might join in the supplication to that principal, is to contradict not only common sense, but daily experience, and the very paragraph itself affords full evidence that the Roman Catholics do act upon this distinction.

"But Roman Catholics, do not, they say, commit idolatry in praying to saints; for they offer them only an inferior worship, and not that which is due to God—they only invoke them, and ask their help in obtaining the benefits which God alone can confer."

The admission here made, renders it unnecessary for me to adduce any farther evidence for the fact that the Roman Catholics do make the distinction.—The word prayer is then susceptible of two meanings, which are totally unlike: and Roman Catholics do not pray to angels and saints in the first sense of the word: to state or to insinuate that they do is to misrepresent them. Your correspondent makes this statement by a miserable quibble upon the ambiguity of the word, prayer, and by an unbecoming equivocation attempts to show against their own declaration, that Roman Catholics do pray to the created spirits in the same way that they offer their prayers to God.

"Surely the *ora pro nobis*, with a view to the benefits which God alone can confer, addressed to an invisible being, and in the same office of devotion in which God is directly supplicated, is, to all intents and purposes, prayer; and what is prayer offered to a creature, whether visible or invisible, if not idolatry."

When we ask another to "pray for us," we avow by the phrase that the person so called upon by us must address himself to another, who can grant what it is not in the power of this intercessor to bestow. Hence, when in the same office of devotion we say "Lord, have mercy on us." "Christ, have mercy on us." "Holy Mary, Pray for us." So far from placing Christ and Mary upon an equal footing, we distinctly profess that mercy is derived only from him, and that she can do no more than obtain from him by her prayer, to bestow the mercy upon

us. Thus if the prayer to the only source of mercy, be worship of adoration; it is evident that by our prayer to the blessed Virgin, we intreat of Mary to adore our Lord Jesus Christ. Your correspondent cannot then assert that we pray to any angel or saint, in the same manner as we do to God, until he shall have discovered us asking God to pray for us to the angels and saints: asking God thus to adore the blessed spirits. Have we then not been misrepresented by him?

But in paragraph 20, he is still less excusable. By a mistranslation and a false suggestion he endeavours to distort the meaning of a prayer in the Mass, to show that we place Jesus Christ and the saints upon the same footing. In paragraph 5, he quotes from the translation of the *Missal*, printed in New York in 1822. He refers to the same edition in paragraph 7. I am to suppose naturally, that he refers to the same book in his quotation in paragraph 20. In that place he gives the following as the prayer on which he builds his argument.

"Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation, which we make to the memory of the Passion," and so forth.

The original Latin is placed in one column and the translation in another upon the same page 281 of the edition referred to, and is the following.

Suscipe Sancta Trinitas hanc oblationem quam tibi offerimus ob memoriam *Passionis, and so forth.*

The translation which he quotes as in authorized use, paragraph 5, gives us the following in page 281:—

"Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which we make to thee *in memory* of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in honour of the blessed Mary ever a virgin, of blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, and all the Saints; that it may be available to their honour, and our salvation: and may they vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate on earth. Through the same Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

His object was to persuade his readers that Jesus Christ and the saints were considered co-equal intercessors, and therefore after the mistranslation, he who complained so much of my having made an addition, paragraph 23, now interpolates in the prayer the phrase (Jesus, and so forth) between the words *they* which he marks in italics, and the words "vouchsafe to intercede:" when such was by no means the meaning of the prayer. I do not think it very unreasonable to suppose that when this critic undertook to help out his own construction by introducing his own words, he looked at the explanation given in the *Missal* itself for the purpose of knowing whether he was fairly representing the doctrine which he undertook to explain. If he did not, he was negligent. If he did, he was dishonest, for he found the following.

"The celebrant then comes to the middle part of the altar, and bowing down, says the next prayer, Receive, O Holy Trinity, and so forth. This prayer, in its present form, is probably a cause of difficulty to some persons who do not examine with sufficient care, nor reflect upon what they too hastily condemn. They object that by this prayer, the church professes to offer the sacrifice equally to the blessed Trinity and to the saints. This is not the fact, nor is such the meaning of the prayer. It consists of three distinct parts. The first requesting the oblation to be received in memory of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is distinct, and the plain meaning of the request is evidently conformable to the institution.[62] "Do this for a commemoration of me." The second part, requesting the oblation to be received in honour of the blessed Virgin, and other saints—that it may be available to their honour and to our salvation. This latter clause, 'our salvation,' creates no difficulty. The question is now what is meant by offering the sacrifice in honour of the Saints? First, then, the word honour in the first part of the prayer, is clearly not an exact, though it be a literal translation of the original prayer—for it should be rather translated on the festival of the blessed Virgin, and so forth. Le Brun remarks[63] that the words found in the oldest copies are *in honore*, and not *in honorem*, and states also, that the words *ad honorem* found immediately after, strengthens the proof of this reading being correct, for the persons who framed the prayer would otherwise have fallen into a glaring and inexplicable tautology. *In honore* evidently ought to be translated "on the festival or at the time we honour." Thus it would appear as well from the critical examination, as from various facts which that author adduces, that this is the true meaning of this first phrase. But *ad honorem*, "that it may be available to their honour" i. e., the saints, is distinct, we must then see its meaning.

"St. Augustine writes, 'So that although we raise altars to the memory of the martyrs, we do not build any to them. For which of our prelates at any time celebrating at the altar in any of the places of the saints, has said, "We offer unto thee, Peter, or Paul, or Cyprian?" But that which is offered, is offered to God, who has crowned the martyrs, at those places where is celebrated their memory whom he has crowned.' And again, in another place, 'Nor do we give to those martyrs temples, priests and sacrifices: because, not they, but their God is our God.' Thus no sacrifice was offered to the saints, though places were consecrated to their memory, where their virtues were honoured, and altars raised at which this honour was paid. Not by sacrifice to them, but by sacrifice to God; to their God and ours, to him who enabled them by his grace to triumph over sin, and to obtain glory—the honour we pay to them redounds to him, who in them has crowned his own graces; and when we pray that this sacrifice may be received by the Godhead, it is to the Holy Trinity it is offered, not the saints; it is offered in commemoration of Christ, on the festival of the saints, perhaps in places consecrated to God in their memory, and we pray it may be available to their honour; we do not offer it to them that they may receive it—this would be idolatry. But it is offered to God to their honour; and so far from this being derogatory to the honour of Christ, or against his institution, it is calculated to promote his honour, and in conformity with his institutions; for when we honour the saints, we only pay to God the homage of our praise for their perfections, we praise his work in them, and their glory redounds to Him who created

[62] *Luke* xxii. v. 19.
[63] *Explic. lit. hist. and dog.* part iii. art. ix.

them and sanctified them: and surely it was to procure them honour, and glory, and salvation, that he sacrificed himself on Calvary, and we only repeat the offering for the purpose of commemorating and fulfilling his institutions. Nay, he distinctly declares,[64] "'For them do I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth, and its consequence, honoured in glory.'"

"Thus the sacrifice is offered to the Trinity, but not to the saints: and, though they are honoured, that respect redounds to the greater blory of the Lord.

"The third part of the prayer is a request, that those saints whose memory we celebrate on earth, may intercede for us in heaven. Here, then, we distinctly point out how far they can assist us, 'by intercession,' to be again subordinate to that of the Redeemer, and only available through his merits; for the prayer concludes by the words, which clearly prove those merits to be the foundation on which we rest all our hope, by those words: 'Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.'

"But why, it is said, need we ask to have our sacrifice received, if that sacrifice be Christ, who must necessarily be acceptable? Because we are not necessarily acceptable, and the object is to apply to us the benefit of this offering, by granting to us those dispositions which will qualify us to profit by that which in itself is excellent.

"This prayer was originally said only on the festivals of saints, and special mention then was made of that saint, whose festival was celebrated: but, during the latter seven hundred or eight hundred years, the special name has been omitted, and the general form used as now. Many of the ancient Missals style it the prayer of St. Ambrose: we, however, have no better evidence to attribute its formation to him."—(*Missal,* Explic. lvii.)

Thus no part of our office, no tenet, no practice of ours, will for a moment countenance the notion that we pray to the created spirits, in the same manner that we do to God: and every attempt to impute this to us, is a misrepresentation; and your correspondent has garbled, changed, added, I may properly say, interpolated and equivocated, in his vain efforts to attain this object. Roman Catholics have at least so much common sense as to know, that God is the Creator of angels and saints, and that these blessed spirits are not their own creators: Catholics know that Jesus Christ is the only Redeemer, and to the Creator, and Redeemer, and Sanctifier only, do they look for mercy at its source.

Having stated the doctrine of Roman Catholics to be, (paragraph 10,) as regards prayer to the angels and saints, "only to invoke them, and ask their help, in obtaining benefits which God alone can confer," the writer with the contradictory name, represented truly the second kind of prayer above described, and which Catholics hold it lawful to use towards any of our fellow-creatures, who can hear and help us. Yet this same correspondent of yours, unqualifiedly calls such invocation and demand of help, idolatry. We now agree in the facts; and our difference is upon principle. Let us see a specimen of his theology, and

[64] *John* xvii. 19.

of its necessary consequences. He lays down the principle, that "prayer offered to a creature, whether visible or invisible, is idolatry." To invoke, means no more than to call upon, and generally for a favour; to invoke and ask help, means that the persoon is called upon to grant that help, as a matter of countesy or favour, not as claimed of right: and this is prayer; by his own statement, such prayer can be offered to visible, equally as to invisible creatures; and your correspondent informs us that it is equally idolatry, in one case, as in the other. I agree perfectly with him in the principle, though I widely differ from him in my results. He would assert that, in each case, it would be idolatry: I say it is not so in either. He admits as a fact, that "Protestants ask the prayers of the faithful, or those they consider so on earth, in the body, that God will comfort them in sorrow, sustain them in trial, and save them from danger." Thus they entreat the faithful in the body, they invoke them: they ask their help, by the *ora pro nobis,* "pray for us," with a view to benefits which God alone can confer; and thus Protestants, according to this theologian, are guilty of idolatry. No, no, for the persons whom they invoke, are in the body:—upon earth. I answer, "they are visible." If they were disembodied spirits, and not upon earth, they would, it is true, be invisible to us, but not the less really in existence: and, whether visible or invisible, the contradictory writer took good care to make his principle embrace both.

It is very true, that another question will fairly offer itself, respecting the wisdom of addressing ourselves to intercessors invisible to us, who have departed from the body: but the question of idolatry and utility are very different. To invoke and pray, in our second meaning of prayer, to an angel or a saint, is then no more idolatry, than to invoke and ask the aid of a creature upon earth; and if Catholics are guilty of this crime, by invoking those spirits, Protestants are equally guilty, by invoking each other. So far, the two cases resemble each other in principle. But here the similarity ceases. He, with apparent triumph, asks whether the cases resemble each other? I say that, in principle, to this extent, they do. Before I take up the point of difference, it might not be amiss for me to remind you of one who certainly besought earnestly the prayers of persons, who, though visible, and on earth, and in the body, yet were to him as perfectly invisible at the time, as any of those blessed spirits, whom I presume you will admit he occassionally saw.

"30. Now, I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me;

"31. That I may be delivered from them that do not believe in Judea; and that my service which I have for Jerusalem, may be accepted of the saints;

"32. That I may come among you with joy by the will of God, and may with you be refreshed." (St. Paul, *Ep. to Rom.*, chap. xv.)

The allegation upon which the charge of idolatry was founded, being, that Roman Catholics prayed to angels and saints, in such a manner as to commit this crime, I apprehend that I should have sufficiently vindicated my denial of the charge, by what I have written; but your correspondent has chosen to go much farther, and it perhaps will be as well to follow him.

We have seen that it would not be idolatry to invoke, or call upon one of the faithful in the body, to unite with us in prayer to God. It remains to examine, whether the mere circumstance of making a similar request of an invisible or spiritual creature, would thereby become idolatry. I will at once say, it would not: because, to constitute that crime, we must give to some creature, visible or invisible, corporeal or spiritual, the homage due to God alone: the mere circumstance of invisibility, or spirituality, will not change the principle. The jet of the crime consists, in giving to a creature, what belongs only to the Creator. Now, we never worship God by asking him to join us in prayer, by asking him "to pray for us," by asking him "to make intercession for us." Hence, to address a fellow-creature in this manner, is not to treat it as we treat God, but in a way which no rational or religious being would act towards the Creator. To address to God such prayers as those which we address to angels and saints, would be to derogate from his honour, and to blaspheme. When, therefore, we thus address the blessed spirits, we do not pay to them the homage which we pay to God.

The other differences alluded to in the tenth paragraph, are: first, a doubt as to whether the being whom we ask to pray for us, is in heaven. Suppose he is not: then the worst will be, that our labour will be just as much lost, as would be that of a good Protestant who would write to a friend in a distant place to pray for him, and the friend dies before the letter arrives. We believe, however, upon grounds which satisfy ourselves, that we can know, in some instances, that God has admitted particular individuals to his presence, and we address ourselves only to them: but, if even here we should, being deluded, ask the prayers of one who is a reprobate, we are in no worse plight, than probably are many of our Protestant friends themselves, who have often been imposed upon by hypocrites, whose prayers they have besought, under the impression of their being virtuous; but surely this mistake is not idolatry.

Your correspondent next states a new difference to be, that we know not that those blessed spirits are accessible, and we can surely have access to the faithful in the body on earth. This I call begging the question: for we assert that there is equally certain access to those blessed spirits. Yet, still were there no access to them, it would only be folly, not idolatry, to ask their prayers.

In the same tenth paragraph, which indeed contains the chief part of his argument, he asserts another difference between the blessed in heaven and the faithful in the body to be, that we know not that the former can pray for us, or help us; whilst we do know that the latter can. This also is assuming what we deny; and such ignorance, if it even existed on our part, would not constitute idolatry.

Upon these grounds, I then state: that idolatry being the giving to any creature the worship due only to God, in order to prove us guilty thereof, in praying to angels and saints, it must be shown that we pray to them in such a way as is due only to God. But we do not pray to them in that manner, but only in that manner in which Protestants pray to just men on earth, in the body; and as this is not on their part idolatry, so neither is our conduct idolatrous. In another place, I shall show that it is neither foolish nor irreligious.

We now come to another point. "Catholics ask salvation through the merits of the angels and saints." No attempt having been made to produce any evidence whatever to sustain the charge of our asking salvation ("to save them") through the merits of the angels, and the proposition being conjunctive, I might, upon this single ground, claim to have the whole assertion rejected as not proved. I shall, however, not use this advantage. I shall merely say that we deny, and our impugner has not attempted to show that denial to be unfounded, that we do pray to the angels to save us by their merits. The only proof adduced is a prayer to the guardian angel, paragraph 4, in which not one syllable of or regarding merits is to be found. I do not, of course, admit the unfounded assertions and repetitions of your correspondent to be proofs.

In paragraph 7, he adduces the documents regarding the merits of the saints; after four prayers, in which mention is made of their merits and one of intercession only, the writer concludes, in paragraph 8: "It is then a fact, that Roman Catholics do pray to angels and saints to save them by their merits." So far as the angels are concerned, it is obviously not a fact. Now, to understand the question properly, we must be clear as to the meaning of the terms used; we should have no quarrel merely about words. Doctrines, and not expressions, form the subject of our inquiry.

I shall first state what I conceive is meant by the expression "save them." I am under the impression that, amongst Protestants, it means, to bring a person from a state of sin, whereby he is exposed to eternal punishment, to a state of justification wherein he becomes entitled to heaven, that is, "save them from hell," which is the place of punishment for sin. The word merits, I believe, is at present, by the great bulk of Protestants in this Union, considered as implying a claim of pure and strict justice on the part of the meritorious, which gives them a complete right to demand an equivalent from the person against whom they have this claim. Thus, the impression conveyed to the Protestant mind by the expression, "A Catholic believes that he can be saved by the merits of the saints," is, that we believe the saints have some demand of strict justice upon God, by reason of some service they have done him, independently of any claim of his upon them; and by virtue of which demand, they can, in strict right, save sinners from hell and bring them to heaven. Now, Roman Catholics consider it a heresy to make any such assertion. They condemn the Pelagians as erring from the faith, for asserting that a man can, by the proper use of his own faculties, merit heaven for himself, which is much less than is implied in the above assertion. Hence it is a misrepresentation of Catholic doctrine to assert, that it teaches that we can be so saved either by our own merits, or by the merits of angels and saints. It is also, of course, a misrepresentation to assert, that we pray to saints in this sense, or in any other like this, to save us by their merits.

Thus, the Catholic doctrine, as laid down in the sixth session of the Council of Trent, on the 13th of January, 1547, is—

"That man cannot, by his own works, which are done either according to the teaching of human nature or of the law, without divine grace through Jesus Christ, be justified before God.—*Canon I.*

"That divine grace is not given through Jesus Christ, merely that a man might with more ease live justly, and merit eternal life; as if he might be able to do so in any manner by free will, without grace; but yet hardly, and with difficulty.—*Canon II.*

"That a man cannot, without the preventing inspiration of the Holy Ghost and his help, believe, hope, love or repent as he ought, so that the grace of justification should be conferred upon him.—*Canon III.*

"That men are not justified without the justice of Christ, by which he merited for us."—*Canon X.*

In the decree concerning original sin, passed on the 17th of June, 1546, in the third paragraph, it is distinctly stated as Catholic doctrine, that this sin cannot be removed by the strength of human nature, nor

by any other remedy "but by the merit of the only mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ, who reconciled us to God, in his blood."

Thus, the only mode by which we can be saved from sin, be justified before God, live justly, believe, hope, love, and repent as we ought, so that the grace of justification should be conferred upon us, and, of course, eternal life procured, is through the divine grace of Jesus Christ, our only reconciling mediator, by and through whose merits only this can be obtained. I could multiply evidences of this being the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, and cite the various texts of Scripture, passages from the fathers, and decisions of previous Councils to which the Council of Trent refers, for the purpose of showing that this was always the doctrine of the Church: but it is unnecessary, for I presume it will be conceded that the Canons of this Council itself will be admitted as sufficient evidence of the fact that such is our doctrine.

How, then, are we to reconcile the collects of the *Missal*, in which we pray to the saints to save us by their merits, with this doctrine? Does not the *Missal* contradict the Council? By no means. The reconciliation is easy between the prayers and the decrees. The meaning of the passage, "save us by his merits," if applied to Jesus Christ in the sense in which those words are understood by Protestants, as above explained, will give the exact meaning of the Council. Now, when Roman Catholics apply the word merit to a creature as regards God, it could not, without a contradiction to their doctrine, have this same meaning: and they declare that such is not the meaning which they attach to the expression; but they explain it in altogether a different sense. Now, every good writer upon logic, as well as every honest man, will tell us that, when we inquire as to a man's belief, we must take his own meaning of his own words, in order to understand what, in fact, he does believe; but if we force upon his words a sense which he disclaims, we do not correctly exhibit his belief, but our own imputation. I shall, in my next letter, explain what we understand by the merits of the saints: it is enough for my present purpose to state, that we do not, in our prayers or other formularies or documents, by any means give to it the meaning which is forced upon us by our opponents.

Now, no one of the prayers "asks salvation" through the merits of the saints. Let us examine them.

"Graciously receive, O Lord, we beseech thee, our offerings, and grant, by the merits of blessed Anastasia the martyr, that they may avail to our salvation. Thro'."

The prayer is addressed to God, and the grace is asked from him, the only fountain of mercy: that grace is, that the offerings (instituted by Jesus Christ) may avail us to salvation, by the merits of a holy mar-

tyr. The previous collect, page 25, asked that "we may be sensible of the effects of her prayers to thee in our behalf;" and this was asked "through" the only way in which her prayer could avail or be received, "Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee in Unity of the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen." Those merits are, in our sense of the word, no more than what eminent Protestant writers, as I shall show, mean by a state of righteousness; and the way in which we believe her merits would be regarded, is found in the meaning which Protestants attach to this text, as read in your version, *James* v. 16. "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." We believe, that a person who, through the merits of Jesus Christ, is justified, and continues to serve God by the practice of virtue, is thereby meritorious before God through his mercy and the merits of the Saviour; and we believe that the Almighty, in regard to this secondary and derived merit, which is [of] a very different kind from that of our Saviour, will more kindly and graciously hear the prayer and grant the request of this righteous person, than the prayer of a sinner, or of a reprobate person. Yet, still, to show whence this merit, such as it is, derives its value, the prayer always concludes with the statement of its foundation "Thro.'" "our Lord Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee in the Unity of the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen." Catholics are so well accustomed to hear these forms of the conclusion, that, generally, only the word "Thro." is printed, for the sake of abbreviation.

Thus, Catholics do not pray to St. Anastasia to be saved by her merits, in the sense in which Protestants understand the phrase; nor do they pray at all "to be saved" by her merits. But they pray to be saved by the institutions of our Lord Jesus Christ; and they ask of God, through the effectual fervent prayer of the righteous or meritorious martyr, that those institutions of Jesus Christ might be made of avail to them, by his bestowing upon them his grace, and creating in them those dispositions without which even the merits and institutions of our only Saviour and Redeemer and Mediator Christ Jesus will not save us. Hence, to represent Catholics as asking to be saved by the merits of the saints, is doing them a gross injustice, and stating that which is not the fact.

In the collect of St. Scholastica and others, your very generous and honourable correspondent stops, as usual, so as to garble the prayer. I give in *italics* what he omitted.

"O God, who to recommend us to innocence of life, wast pleased to let the soul of thy blessed Virgin Scholastica ascend to heaven in the shape of a dove: grant by

her merits *and prayers, that we may lead innocent lives here, and ascend to eternal joys hereafter. Thro'.*''

''O God, who didst grant thy servant John, being inflamed with the glare of thy love, to walk without hurt through the midst of flames, and by him institute a new order in thy church: grant by his merits, *that the fire of thy charity may cure our diseased souls, and obtain for us eternal remedies. Thro'.*''

''O God, who wast pleased to send blessed Patrick, thy bishop and confessor, to preach thy glory to the Gentiles: grant, that by his merits and intercession *we may, through thy grace, be enabled to keep thy commandments. Thro'.*''

These prayers are all addressed to God, calling upon him to save us by his mercy; and the meaning of *the merits* is the same as that above, in the collect of St. Anastasia.

I must return to this topic in my next.

I remain, gentlemen,
Your obedient, humble servant,

B. C.

LETTER IV.

Give them a pilot to their wandering fleet,
Bold in his art, and tutored in deceit;
Whose hand adventurous shall their helm misguide
To hostile shores, or whelm them in the tide.

LUSIAD, *Transl.*, Book I.

CHARLESTON, S. C., June 22, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—In my last letter I stated that the great difficulty as to a proper understanding of the question here at issue between your correspondent with the contradictory name, and me, existed in the equivocal nature of the word *merit*. No Roman Catholic expects to be saved either by his own merits or by the merits of any angel or of any saint; neither does he ask either of them or of God ''to be saved by their merits,'' but only by the merits of Jesus Christ. The prayers to which reference has been made, do ask, indeed, of God, that he, having regard to the merits of the saints, would be more kind and merciful to us, and grant to us an increase of that grace, which is altogether derived from the merits and satisfaction of our Redeemer. But we do not give the same meaning to the phrase *merits of Christ*, that we do to *merits of the blessed Virgin Mary*, or of any other saint. And my present object is to exhibit the different senses in which this word merit is used.

I shall send to the editors of the *Miscellany* a translation of such of the doctrinal chapters of the Council of Trent, as may be necessary

to exhibit our belief regarding the manner in which justification is obtained by the sinner. This will show to whom we look for salvation, because when we become justified, we are saved from hell, unless we should relapse into sin; and it will be seen that this justification is derived solely and exclusively from the merits of Christ, and in no way from the merits of angels or saints.

Let us now proceed to state our doctrine regarding merit. Merit is a claim to a recompense, by reason of some work which is worthy thereof. This claim is of several kinds. I shall notice only two. The first is that between equals, where one has done for another a work which this latter needs or accepts; the agent was free and independent, under no real or implied obligation to him whom he served, but the service was done upon the express or implied condition of obtaining a just recompense. In this case the agent has fully and justly merited, and the recompense cannot, without palpable injustice, be refused. Even though there should have been no covenant, yet if the service was necessary, and could not then be done by any other agent, there would exist a just ground of claim.

No created being can stand in such a relation as this to God, because all our works are due to him, by reason of our creation and conservation; we have nothing to bestow upon him which he cannot justly claim by several previous titles. Thus, neither are we independent, nor are we exempt from his just claims. Hence, though the works of creatures could in their own nature be of sufficient value to make atonement for our fallen race, men and angels united could not offer anything which was truly their own and free from the claim of the Creator. Thus, the united efforts of angels and saints could not, by their merits, save one sinner. But the works of the incarnate Son of God, being free from claim, and his person independent, so too were his acts; they were also, by reason of his infinite perfections, of infinite value; and by them we are freely and fully saved from ruin, and justified, when through the divine mercy we are made partakers thereof.

When a man is thus justified by the application of Christ's merits to his soul, we say that he may thereafter, for the first time, become meritorious by observing the law of God; but the nature of his merits will differ essentially from that of the Saviour's merits. In the first place, the righteous or justified man is acceptable only by reason of the merits of the Son of God: hence his are not independent merits. Next, he cannot of strict justice claim any recompense, but what is freely promised by God; thus his claim is founded upon the merits of Christ, and the covenant by which the Creator freely bound himself to give a reward

to those works, and not upon any intrinsic natural value of his own deeds. Thus it is clear, that when we say persons in a state of sanctity or justification have merit for their good works, we always understand that those works are raised to this grade of excellence through the free mercy of God, and by the free merits of Christ, and that they create no demand upon God, farther than in virtue of his own voluntary covenant. That the Almighty could claim them by several previous titles, but having mercifully waived those claims, he has promised us that he would give to us a recompense or reward for deeds, to perform which he even now aids us by the grace of Jesus Christ, without which we could not do those works as we ought; and that when he thus rewards the saints, he by this recompense crowns his own gifts in them. This is the only merit which Catholics believe the saints can have in his sight.

We believe that all men obtain sufficient grace, and have free will. We know that God promises a recompense to those who, using that freedom as they ought, co-operate with his grace. We also know that he threatens punishment to those who, abusing that freedom, and rejecting this grace, do wickedly. We therefore say that the first persons, through the grace of Jesus Christ, merit heaven, and that the second, by their criminality, merit hell. The first possess what we call merit, properly speaking,—the latter what we call demerit. Hence may be clearly seen what we mean by the merits of the saints, and that it is a very different sort from that of the Saviour. I deem it unnecessary to enter into proof of the positions which I have here taken, as my object is rather to exhibit what our doctrine truly is, than to defend it,—to show that we have been misrepresented, rather than to show that we believe as Christ taught.

In order that a man might be capable of merit of even this description, it is required by our tenets that the person shall have been already saved from hell, and justified by the merits of Christ Jesus.—Amongst a variety of scriptural reasons for this assertion, perhaps one would suffice at present.

"Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye abide in me.

"I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing." (*John* xv. 4, 5).

To this text, amongst others, the Council of Trent refers in its doctrinal chapter regarding merit, which I here insert. The branch (man) really brings forth the fruit of merit, but only because the branch itself derives its sap, or the virtue, from Jesus Christ, the vine, through which stock alone this virtue can be drawn from the root of merciful atonement. The sinner who is not justified, whose works are not influenced by grace,

is not grafted on this vine-stock; he can do nothing. Hence the council teaches in the same chapter, (Chap. xvi. Sess. vi):

"Upon this ground, therefore, whether they shall perpetually have preserved that grace which they received, or recovered that which they lost, the words of the Apostle are to be placed before justified men * [a]. Abound in every good work, knowing that your labour is not in vain in the Lord [b]: for God is not unjust that he should forget your work, and the love which you have shown in his name. And, [c] Do not lose your confidence, which hath a great reward. And therefore, to those doing well [d] unto the end, and hoping in God, eternal life is to be proposed, it being as well, that grace mercifully promised through Christ Jesus [e] to the children of God; as also, the reward to be faithfully given as a recompense [f], by reason of the promise of God himself, to their good works and merits. For this is that crown of justice [g] which the Apostle said was laid up for him, to be given to him by the just judge, after his fight and course; and not only to him, but also to all that love his coming; for since he, Christ Jesus himself, as a head into the members, and as a vine [h] into the branches, continually infuses virtue into those justified, (which virtue always precedes their good works, and accompanies and follows them, and without which they could on no account be agreeable to God and meritorious;) it is to be believed that nothing more is needful for those justified, but that they might be considered, indeed, by those works which are done in God, to have fully satisfied the divine law according to the state of this life; and have truly merited (if indeed [i] they shall have departed in grace) to obtain eternal life also in its proper time, since Christ himself says [k], If any one shall drink of the water which I will give him, he shall not thirst for ever; but it shall become in him a fountain of water springing up to eternal life. So neither [l] is our own proper justice established as our own, proper from ourselves, nor is the justice of God overlooked or rejected: for that righteousness which is called ours, because we are justified by its inhering in us, is that same righteousness of God, because it is poured into us by God, through the merit of Christ. Nor is that either to be omitted, that although in the sacred letters so much is attributed to good works, that even Christ himself promises [m] that whosoever will give a drink of cold water to one of those least ones will not lose his reward: and the Apostle testifies [n] that what in the present is but for a moment and light of our tribulation, worketh in us above degree exceedingly on high, an eternal weight of glory: far be it from us, however, that a Christian man should so confide [o] or glory in himself, and not in the Lord whose goodness towards men is so great, that he wishes those things which are his gifts to be their merits. And because [p] we all offend him, in many things, so each one of us ought to have severity and judgment before his eyes, as he has mercy and goodness; nor ought any one judge himself [q] even though he should not be conscious to himself of anything: for all the life of man is to be examined not only by human judgment, but by that of God [r]: who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness and will make manifest the counsels of

---

The following references show the parts of Scripture, according to the Vulgate, which contain the doctrine above laid down.

* [a] *I Cor.* xv; [b] *Heb.* vi; [c] *Heb.* x; [d] *Matt.* x. and xxiv; [e] *Ps.* cii; [f] *Rom.* v; [g] I *Tim.* iv; [h] *John* xv; [i] *Apocal.* xiv; [k] *John* iv; [l] *Rom.* x; [m] *Matt.* x, *Mark* ix and so forth; [n] *I Cor.* iv; [o] *I Cor.* i, *II Cor.* x and so forth; [p] *James* iii; [q] *I Cor.* iv; [r] *I Cor.* iv; [s] *Matt.* xvi, *Rom.* ii and so forth.

the hearts; and then shall every man have praise from God: who as it is written will render to every man according to his works."

What we call the merits of justified persons, then evidently rest upon the merits of Christ, as their foundation: first, because their justification can be had only through his merits; and secondly, because no man can do meritorious works until after he is thus justified, and the merit of those works is derived from that of the Saviour, as the fruit of the branch is derived only from that virtue or sap which has been drawn from the trunk of the vine. The saints are those persons who are justified by the merits of Christ, and dying in the state of grace, are now in heaven, partakers of his redemption. As we would expect aid, and ask it through the prayers of a justified person on earth, we also expect it from their prayers, now that they are in heaven: and as to hope for efficacy from the prayers of a just man upon earth, because of his being meritorious or righteous in the sight of God would not be asking that man to save us by his merits, so confidence that God will have favourable regard to the merits or righteousness of these heavenly supplicants, is not asking those saints to save us by their merits; and the merits of these saints, who have no virtue or power or merit but what has been obtained from the mercy of God through the original and independent merits of Jesus Christ, are of a nature far different from, and infinitely below the merits of our Redeemer.

In the twenty-fourth session, the council published a decree concerning the invocation of saints, in which it desires the faithful to be taught, according to the usage received from the earliest days of the Church.

"That the saints reigning with Christ do offer their prayers to God for man: that it is good and useful to invoke them by way of supplication: that it is good and useful to have recourse to their prayers, help, and aid, for the purpose of obtaining benefits from God, through his son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour."

The decree charges the bishops farther, to use their utmost diligence and best exertions to prevent any abuse or superstition or other impropriety in this practice. It is clear, therefore, that Roman Catholics, though they do pray to the saints to aid them by their prayers to God, and do ask for their help to obtain benefits from God through the merits of Jesus Christ their only Saviour and Redeemer, do not pray to the saints to save them by their merits.

In the twenty-second session, chapter iii., the council teaches—

"That although the church hath been sometimes accustomed to celebrate some masses to the honour and memory of the saints, yet she does not teach that sacrifice ought to be offered to them, but to God only, who hath crowned them, whence

the priest is not used to say, I offer sacrifice to thee, Peter, or Paul; but giving thanks to God for their victories, he implores their patronage; that they whose memory we celebrate on earth, may intercede for us in heaven.

If you, gentlemen, will compare these testimonies of our doctrine, drawn from our highest and [most] undeniable authority, with the production of your extraordinary correspondent, bearing the curious name, you must at once perceive how grossly he has misrepresented our tenets, and you cannot avoid seeing the dishonest garbling and misconstruction of our prayers, of which he has been guilty in his paragraph No. 20. I could adduce much more evidence, but where is the necessity?

I now state that it is a misrepresentation of our doctrine and practice to state, as your "Protestant Catholic" correspondent does, first, That we pray to angels to save us by their merits; and secondly, That we pray to saints to save us by their merits, so as to make those saints mediators with Christ or in his stead; and, thirdly, That we give to creatures the worship due to God alone; and, fourthly, That we are thus guilty of idolatry.

But since the chief topic which is relied upon as the basis for charging us with error, is our assertion that a man who is justified by Christ upon repentance can afterwards do anything for which he may have merit, I shall adduce the testimony of an eminent prelate of the English Protestant Church, in support of the correctness of our doctrine on this head. I could produce several, but I shall confine myself to one, and he was no great admirer of Roman Catholics, as two or three extracts from his writings will show.

"The wonder is not that the professed members of the Church of Rome unite their hearts and hands, and leave no methods, whether of deceit or violence, unattempted for the service of that cause, which in all their lowest fortunes, they never suffer to be removed out of their sight; that they put on all forms of complaisance and dissimulation; of civility and good humour, even to heretics themselves, to inveigle them into their own ruin; that they flatter, and promise, and swear everything that is good and kind to their fellow-labourers, and at the same time enter into all the resolutions of destruction and desolation, whenever an opportunity of power shall come. This is nothing but what is worthy of themselves, and of that church to the slavery of which they have devoted themselves. It is no more than what they openly and publicly profess; if Protestants will but open their eyes and see it. It is their religion and their conscience: it is inculcated upon them as the great condition of their acceptance with God, that no good nature of their own; no obligations from others; no ties of oaths, and solemn assurances; no regard to truth, justice, or honour; are to restrain them from anything, let it be of what sort soever; that is for the security or temporal advancement of their church."

Such, gentlemen, is the calumny published in a sermon! by that great friend of civil and religious liberty!!! the Right Reverend father in God, Benjamin Hoadley, D.D., successively Bishop of Bangor, Here-

ford, Salisbury, and Winchester. Yea, of a truth, he loved not Popery! The above is taken from a sermon preached at St. Peter's Poor, November 5th, (Cecil's holiday,) 1715, from the text, "And for this cause, God shall send them a strong delusion, that they shall believe a lie," (*II Thess.* ii. 11), entitled, "The present Delusion of many Protestants considered."—pages 623, and so forth, volume iii. of his works, edit. London, MDCCLXXIII. I shall give but one other extract from the same sermon, though I could give a great number from the various parts of the works of this liberal and enlightened prelate, as he is styled in contradistinction to several of his fellows who were indeed more virulent, and compared with whom, he might be called liberal and benevolent.

"But in the Romish Church, it is firmly settled upon never altered principles; it is an established article of religion; equally believed, and owned, and inculcated in their adversity and low estate, as in the hight of their power. It stands unrepealed upon record, and it is confirmed by experience, that they are most likely not to fail of the honours of saintship, and the applauses of that church, who act the most uniformly, and the most steadily upon that foundation. Every weapon they use is sanctified; every instance of fraud and perfidiousness; every degree of violence and fury, is consecrated. It is not only allowed, but first recommended, and afterwards rewarded."

No wonder that persons who derive their notions of Roman Catholics and of their religion from such sources as this, should be tempted to thank God that they are not like the worse than publicans described by these holy men! We cannot be astonished than in an old British colony, looking to Britain for her literature and her religion, and whose children were taught, for British political reasons, to despise a church which she had always theretofore persecuted, much of such information as that above should be instilled into the mind! Nor can we expect that in one generation it could be obliterated! Thus, gentlemen, though your curious correspondent has fallen into extravagant mistakes, I am far from attributing his misrepresentations to any personal malevolence. I would merely suggest, for the consideration of some of those who appear desirous to charge us with those characteristics, the light in which all well-informed men at present view what this liberal father in God wrote about a century ago. In less than half that time, our successors will scarcely believe that at the present day Americans would be found capable of exhibiting themselves as our assailants do.

But it is time to leave this digression and to see what this prelate of the Protestant Church teaches, regarding the merits of Christian men's works. In his Sermon xii., *Of relying upon the merits of Christ for salvation*, page 570, volume iii., he gives as the doctrine of the English Protestant Church,—

"That there can be no pardon, nor salvation, demanded or hoped for, but by such as forsake their sins, and obey the moral laws of the Gospel: and in other words that the sufferings of Christ have actually procured these conditions to be granted by Almighty God; so that those sinners who have forsaken their sins and entered upon a new course of action, may obtain justification from the guilt of their former sins, and eternal happiness in the kingdom of heaven."

After having at some length sustained this position, which requires the co-operation of man with God's grace, he proceeds to combat an error which he thus describes:

"It is manifest that there have been, especially in these latter ages, and still are, (in a very vicious generation of men,) multitudes of Christians, who were not content with this, that God should pardon the sins which they have forsaken for the sake of the merits of Christ: but profess to believe that he will pardon all the sins which they can possibly continue in, till death overtakes them; if so be, they can but have time to declare their trust in Christ's merits to this purpose; or, in the usual promises of God made to Christians for the sake of his son Jesus Christ. They seem to think that Christ's merit excuseth them from attempting to have any merit in themselves; nay, that it would derogate from, and disparage his merits, if they should pretend to have anything in themselves so much as agreeable to the will of God; that it would be a piece of unpardonable presumption in them, to pretend to imitate the moral perfections of God, though they are called upon to be holy, as He is holy."

Thus, according to Bishop Hoadley, the Protestant Church of England does not teach that it is a derogation from the merits of Christ, for a man who has repented and been justified through those merits, to strive by the co-operation with God's grace to have the merit of being holy; by endeavouring to imitate the moral perfections of God, though imperfectly and at a great distance. But in his next sermon (xiii. 576), *Mistakes about man's inability, and God's grace considered*, he is more explicit. He undertakes to examine and confute pernicious mistakes. "The mistakes at which I now particularly point, are such as are founded upon a very fatal notion of the weakness and inability of men; and of the part which Almighty God is to act in the business of reformation and holiness." Commenting on his text, Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God, (*II Cor.* iii. 5), he writes:

"St. Paul himself builds no such doctrine upon that great and strong notion which he had of his own insufficiency: and of the sufficiency of God. This insufficiency, I have shown, already had reference to the work of his Apostleship; and to his successful performance of it, and so forth. . . He doth not presently infer, that nothing was to be done by himself, considered as distinct from his great patron. But in this very Epistle, he represents himself and the other Apostles as workers together with God (chap. vi. 1); and often speaks of his indefatigable endeavors to answer the ends of his office. And if he were a worker together with God, he certainly had a part of his own distinct from that of Almighty God, in this great affair.

And consequently, as he had God Almighty's sufficiency to support him, and make up his deficiencies; so he had likewise some strength and ability of his own for his own part. And as God was the architect, the chief builder, director, and encourager of the whole, so likewise was the Apostle, a worker, under and together with him.''

In his Sermon xiv, he answers an objection that it would be stripping God of his honour and glory to attribute to man any share in his amendment, reformation, and salvation.

In his Sermon xix., page 827, *The best Christians unprofitable servants*, he misrepresents the doctrine of Roman Catholics, by stating it to be that which it is not. But we shall see what he lays down as the doctrine of the English Protestant Church. He explains the text *Luke* xviii. 10, ''So likewise when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do, to mean,'' ''Where you have done your duty to God, and performed the services He has commanded, you cannot claim the happiness, as a reward due in justice to your services, which God will in mercy give you.'' Such too is our explanation, as has been seen above.

When in the course of the sermon he proceeds to examine what is meant by the word unprofitable, he justly observes,—

''We must not imagine that our Lord declares, or insinuates that the best Christians, and such as have exercised themselves in all the good works of his holy religion, ought to acknowledge themselves to have done nothing in what is called the service of God, or for the good of mankind; or of any significancy for their own salvation; or that anything like this is the meaning of the words unprofitable servants. Far be such thoughts from us, concerning him, who in another parable represents himself or his Father as speaking to every Christian of this sort, Well done, good and faithful servant; enter into the joy of thy Lord.'' (*Matt.* xxv. 20, 23).

He then proceeds to show that he is not the unprofitable servant mentioned in verse 30 of the same chapter, who is wicked and slothful, and punished. But he is unprofitable, because he cannot increase the happiness of God; because of his many lesser faults and failings; because of the imperfections of his best actions. Again, because the capacity being derived from God, they are unprofitable in themselves and their own merits, and what good they do as Christians is derived from God's mercy and the grace of Christ. In all this he does not contradict our doctrine. But we now approach to a new point in which he still farther upholds us.

''I will now add an observation or two, not foreign to what I have been saying; and so conclude.

''1. The subject we have been treating may naturally lead us to a question which has been sometimes asked by those who, I fear, are much more willing to know what is not their strict duty, than to practise what they know to be so: and that is,

whether any Christian can do more than he is commanded, or, than it is his strict duty, to do?

"To this, I think, it may be answered, that no Christian can possibly do more, in the great points of moral duty, rightly understood, which are the good works required in the Gospel, than he is strictly obliged to do; because these points are always indispensably necessary, and the obligation to duties never released or abated: But that, in other points, and these not displeasing to God, which may be said to belong to his religious service, as circumstances of it, a Christian may do more than what is strictly enjoined, as absolutely necessary to his salvation.

"This may be the better understood from what St. Paul says of himself; viz., that he chose to preach the Gospel to the Corinthians without any charge to them, in order to have a greater influence in the exercise of his office amongst them; and that this was more than he was strictly obliged to do. For it is plain that he (as well as others) was obliged to do whatever he apprehended to be most for the honour of God, and the interest of his Gospel. And yet it is also as plain, from his own words, that, had he taken a maintenance of them, he could have justified himself before God; and had ground for boasting, that he did not. He expressly distinguishes between his strict obligation to preach the Gospel, and the circumstance of preaching it without charge to them. Wo to me if I preach not the Gospel. This is my indispensable duty. But whether I shall take a maintenance for doing this or not, this is left free for me, and I have chosen not to do it: this is the ground of my boasting. (*I Cor.* ix. 16, 19).

"I might mention also what is written of the first believers, that those amongst them who had possessions, sold them, and laid the price at the feet of the Apostles, to be distributed, in common, to all who wanted. It is evident, of these persons, that they were strictly obliged to the duty of charity to their brethren in want: and yet, it is also plain that this particular behaviour of those who voluntarily and honestly performed the service, in so extraordinary a manner, was more than was commanded them by their great Master. Nay, it is declared by St. Peter, (*Acts* v. 4), that it was not their strict duty, but a matter left to their own choice. From whence it appears, that, in this, they did more than it was their strict duty to do."

It is true that after this passage he lashes most soundly what he is pleased to call the Romish Doctrine, but the doctrine which he lashes, is not, and never was that of our Church. I will then state that according to an eminent bishop of the English Protestant Church, it is not incompatible with her doctrine, to hold, and the Scripture teaches, that men justified through the mercy of God, the merits of Christ, and sincere repentance, can work with God by the grace of Christ, and thus do good works, which have, through God's mercy and covenant, a claim for reward, and are meritorious: and that they not only can do what they are commanded, and is their strict duty as absolutely necessary to their salvation, but can also in addition to this, do more than what they are so commanded, more than is their strict duty to insure salvation, and yet in all this do not derogate from the merits of Christ. Now if the persons whom we look upon to be saints have done this, as Bishop Hoadley says one of them (St. Paul) undoubtedly did, one of two consequences

must ensue; Bishop Hoadley misrepresents the doctrines of the Church of England, or no person in her communion can object to our doctrine on those points.

In my next I shall apply what I have been hitherto collecting and explaining.

I remain, gentlemen,

Your obedient humble servant,

B. C.

LETTER V.

But, mortals! know, 'tis still our greatest pride
To blaze those virtues, which the good would hide.
Rise, Muses, rise! add to your tuneful breath,
These must not sleep in darkness and in death.
She said: in air the trembling music floats,
And on the winds triumphant swell the notes;
So soft, tho' high, so loud, and yet so clear,
Ev'n list'ning angels lean from heaven to hear:
To furthest shores th' ambrosial spirit flies,
Sweet to the world, and grateful to the skies.

POPE, *Temple of Fame.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., June 29, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—I have now exhibited to you, reasons which justify my asserting that Roman Catholics do not pray to angels to be saved by their merits; that they do not pray to angels in the same manner that they pray to God the creator of angels; but in the manner, upon the same principle and for the same purpose that good Protestants beseech their fellow-worshippers on earth, to pray to God for them, and help them by their intercession; and therefore Roman Catholics do not give to those creatures the worship which is due to God alone, nor are they as regards angels guilty of either direct or indirect idolatry. And further, that when Roman Catholics look upon Christ as their mediator, they consider his mediation to be more than a mere intercession; they look upon it to be a full and perfect atonement in which he by his own unclaimable and infinite merits and bitter sufferings made abundant satisfaction for their sins, for which no created merits or power could satisfy: that they do not consider that angels could or did become atoning mediators for man; and hence that although angels might, and can, and do, intercede or pray for us, they are not mediators of satisfaction or atonement, either with Christ or in his stead. Hence that asking

the intercession of angels is not dishonouring the mediation of Christ.

All that I have written of angels is equally applicable to saints, but that in regard to the latter, we pray to God that he would regard their merits as intercessors. Upon this, however, no difficulty can exist in any honest mind that calmly and dispassionately views without prejudice what we mean by the word merit as applied to the saints, who have been human beings, justified through Christ, and were subsequently removed to glory in heaven. It is evidently but an appeal to God, to act upon his own well-known and clearly revealed principles, that he would yield mercy upon the entreaty of those his righteous servants, through the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ our only atoning and redeeming mediator. It is then clear that we are misrepresented by those who say, that we pray to saints to save us by their merits: for we ask to be saved only through the merits of Christ, through whom alone salvation comes, and we therefore acknowledge with St. Peter, [65] that there is no other name, save that of Jesus, given under heaven whereby we may be saved. We are misrepresented by those who say that we make the saints mediators with Christ, or in his stead; because we profess and testify, that though they are intercessors who pray for us, they are not mediators by whom we are redeemed; and we proclaim with St. Paul, [66] that as there is but one God, there is but one mediator between God and man; the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all. We are far from saying that any saint gave himself as a ransom for us; though in virtue of the ransom paid by Christ Jesus for this saint, and the fidelity of that ransomed saint to divine grace, his intercession might prevail much, and if so, he is acceptable through Christ, and therefore, instead of dishonouring Christ, we honour him by showing the powerful effects of his atonement and ransom in this creature who was once a frail mortal. Hence, to charge us with idolatry in this, is to charge that the honour, which we give to those saints, is the honour due to Christ. Surely, we do not deny to Christ the glory of being the ransom, and the only ransom for our sins, yet we deny this glory to the saints and angels. We do not say that the merits of Christ are valuable, only in as much as they are derived from the superior merits of saints; yet we say the merits of saints are only valuable as drawn from the underived, original, and superior merits of Christ Jesus. Gentlemen,—I ask in sober sadness,—is it possible that you can find any human being who with this fair view of our tenets before him, will say that the worship which we pay to our Saviour the incarnate God, is only that same which

[65] *Acts* iv. 12.
[66] I *Tim.* ii. 5, 6.

we pay to the blessed spirits? Yet such is the assertion of your extraordinary correspondent!! But how wretched is his attempt in paragraph 8.

"It is then a fact, that 'the Roman Catholics do pray to angels and saints, to save them by their merits,' making those angels and saints mediators with Christ, or in his stead. It is not unreasonable or unfair, to presume the saint to be even substituted as mediator for Christ, where, as is sometimes the case, the collect does not name Christ, or contain or end with any reference to him in the character of intercessor."

Let him produce the collect which omits to exhibit Christ as *mediator*. There might be several where he is not exhibited as an intercessor. Upon an assertion which he makes without evidence, and against evidence, he builds his conclusion "it is not unreasonable or unfair, *to presume*, the saint to be even substituted as mediator for Christ." Indeed, indeed he has been *too presumptuous*, and too unreasonable, and altogether dishonest and unfair.

His ninth paragraph confounds two distinct things, mediation and intercession, and by this sophistry he endeavours to force a conclusion against the lawfulness of any other intercession, save that of Christ, upon the principle that St. Paul, (*I Tim.* ii. 5), asserted that there is but one mediator. But whoever will look to the text will find that the word used by St. Paul does not mean *intercessor*, but *mediator of ransom*. This is what logicians call "a syllogism with four terms," one of the worst and most deceitful attempts to mislead.

Another attempt is made in the same paragraph to combine for one conclusion two texts which relate to things not of the same kind; that from the gospel of St. John exhibits the Saviour, telling his disciples to pray to the Father in his name, or by his merits, for hitherto they had not prayed in this manner, (*John* xv. 24), and they also were accustomed rather to request of him to ask on their behalf, (*John* xv. 26), and now he desired that they might pray themselves, to the father, yet in his name. Thus the passages here merely regard prayer. The text from *Acts* iv. 12, it will be seen, by no means teaches that we ought not to ask of others to intercede for us, or to pray with us, but merely and exclusively shows that this Jesus who was crucified, was the Messias, in whom all should believe, and through whom only salvation was to be obtained. Let us see the argument which the two texts will obviously make. "Jesus Christ tells the Apostles to pray in his name." "St. Peter tells us that there is only the name of Jesus in which salvation can be had." My inference from these two propositions will not go beyond this: "therefore, it is useful to pray in the name of Christ; and it is unprofitable, or perhaps, unlawful, to seek salvation through any

other name." In fact it is but repeating the propositions of the texts in other words,—and the substance will be no more than what has been repeated, "Christ is our only saviour." But it says not "our only intercessor." Should we confine intercession to our Saviour, every person who asks any other to pray for him, dishonours Christ. This, gentlemen, would produce bad times for the clergy, whose intercession is so frequently besought.

We next come to his statements regarding the blessed Virgin,—and here the poor gentleman is really to be pitied, for he is in pain, (par. 11), and the contemplation of the proof which he has at hand to fix upon us the crime of downright idolatry, is so trying to his nerves that he only adduces a little, but that "little will suffice." Let us see his proofs. They are drawn from three sources. The first is the *Laity's Directory, for 1822, New York, W. H. Creagh, Publisher.* Suppose this book contained blasphemy, is the Roman Catholic Church chargeable therewith? A church is accountable for her liturgy, and therefore it was fair and lawful to charge us as a body, with the prayers and passages of the *Missal*; a church is justly chargeable with the declarations of doctrine which her prelates publish in her name, or as expositions of her tenets, provided those publications are generally known and received and not contradicted: and therefore the *Catechisms* and other such exposions put forth by our bishops are justly quoted for or against us. But it is quite a novelty in a religious disquisition to quote an obscure, unauthorized, ephemeral compilation, printed merely for his own gain, by a man who, if he had any religion, was a member of the Church of England; in order to prove that Roman Catholics hold tenets which cannot be deduced from their works of authority. The name of a very respectable priest in New York appears on its title-page, as if the book was revised and corrected by him: but even high as is the station of that esteemed priest, still the church is not accountable for his publications. The work itself is, 1st, a calendar, 2d, a sermon, 3d, practical instructions for the Sundays, feasts, and so forth, of the year, and 4th, an account of the Catholic churches and other institutions of the United States. The following notice with which it opens will show that it was not sent forth either by authority or as perfect.

"Notice.—The *Laity's Directory* is published this year for the first time in the United States of America. It is intended to accompany the *Missal*, with a view to facilitate the use of the same. Considerable pains have accordingly been taken to render it correct, as well in the Calendar, as in the general information it contains. The errors, it is hoped, are not many: such however as may exist of the kind, the spirit that reigns throughout this little work will suffice to show and to satisfy the Catholic public they have not been intentional."

The Directory was never republished.—Yet here is a writer who has before him, according to his own account, the authorized works, and still proceeds to build up his charge against the Catholic Church, upon a mere evanescent, unauthorized calendar!! I object to the principle of admitting such documents as evidence in a case of this description. Yet I shall now take up his facts, from this document, which your correspondent garbles, as usual.

His object is to show that this pamphlet calls upon Catholics to commit downright idolatry, in their worship of the blessed Virgin. I forget if I ever yet saw a Protestant's definition of idolatry. I shall therefore set down the Catholic definition. Giving to any creature the worship due only to God. Now to prove that this document calls for idolatry, it must be shown that it calls for that worship that is due only to God, to be given to Mary. If the book calls for any such worship I shall condemn the *Directory*, but not the Church. It does not call for any such. The garbled extract is found in paragraph 11. It states that Mary is invoked, even in the Mass: this I have before disposed of. Next, that the Church has instituted almost as many feasts in her honour, as she celebrates in honour of her divine Son. If the word honour has the same meaning in each place, I say the doctrine is not that of the Church:—but the writer of the *Directory* has not given that meaning to the passage, for in the very second line he drew the distinction: and by the suppression of that portion of the document, an unfair exhibition is given of the remainder. The words of the writer are far more strong in regard to the devotion towards Mary, than are those of any strict and close explanation of doctrine by a competent tribunal: and though I cannot find in the phrases anything which is against the doctrine of the Church, yet they are much better suited to the expression of private, individual devotion, than to doctrinal explanation; they are unnecessarily and hyperbolically strong, though not, strictly speaking, inaccurate.

The following is the whole paragraph; the words are printed as in the original.

"*On the Feasts of the Blessed Virgin.* All the Festivals of the Blessed Virgin should be dear to Christians; because after God, Mary is the most worthy object of their devotion. In all ages, the faithful have honoured and invoked the Blessed Virgin; and thus has that prophecy been accomplished, which is found in her celebrated canticle, where she says, that from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. (*Luke* i. 48). The Catholic Church invokes Mary in every part of the divine office, and more especially in the oblation of the holy sacrifice of the Mass. Besides, she has instituted almost as many Feasts in her honour, as she celebrates in honour of her divine Son. It is the duty of every Christian to join in this devotion of the Church, and celebrate worthily all these Feasts. We shall set down something on each one of them in particular."

In this there is nothing to lead to the conclusion that Mary is to receive such worship as is due only to Christ, but a statement that her memory and virtues are honoured on almost as many festivals, as are specially celebrated in honour of the Birth, Manifestation, Circumcision, Transfiguration, Crucifixion, Resurrection, Holy Name and Ascension of our blessed Lord Jesus. As yet then, we have neither upright nor downright idolatry.

The next proof is in paragraph 12, which is a garbled extract from the following:

On the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin. "The birth of the Blessed Virgin is celebrated in the same sentiments as her Conception: the Church makes use of the same office for both Feasts: and in fact, it is the same grace in Mary which sanctified her Conception and Nativity. Mary was born for great purposes: never did any creature render so much glory to God; never did one procure so much good to mankind: by giving us a Redeemer, she gave us everything. We must beg her in this Feast to preserve in us, by her prayers, what she has obtained for us from heaven."

The charge is that we pay to her the same worship we pay to Christ, as God. We say that she obtained from heaven, for us, something. What was that something?—The Redeemer: that she gave him to us. The question is, Did she obtain him by her merits?—If the book says "yes," I condemn it: for the Catholic Church tells me that she did not. But she did in fact, obtain him from heaven, by the mercy of heaven to us, for Mary had no claim to be selected amongst all the other daughters of men: and the compiler of the Calendar himself distinctly holds the same doctrine; for, mentioning the fact, he writes.

On the Annunciation. "The Annunciation is both a Feast of Jesus Christ and the Blessed Virgin; because it was on this day that the Word was made flesh, and Mary became the mother of God. This was the greatest of all days, the object of the sighs of the patriarchs and prophets: the day on which the only Son of God united himself to our nature in the unity of person. This miracle, the greatest the Almighty ever wrought, was operated in the womb of Mary, as in the most worthy temple of the Divine Majesty.

"From the very earliest ages, this Feast has always been regarded as of great obligation; and every faithful Christian should accordingly expand his heart in sentiments of love and gratitude, in the contemplation of so inestimable a benefit; the Church would even wish that the thought of this mystery would never escape our memory: and with this view she exhorts the faithful to recite the Angelus thrice every day, and puts them in mind of it, by the sound of the bell.

"This same day was also the most glorious to Mary; for by becoming the mother of God, she was elevated far above every creature, and became worthy of the respect both of angels and of men: thus we find the angel Gabriel accosted her with respect, and was the first to proclaim her Blessed. Let us repeat, with all possible devotion, the beautiful prayer which begins with this salutation; and let us never cease soliciting the protection of the mother of God."

We ask her to preserve in us, "by her omnipotence." No.—God forbid,—"by her prayers," the prayers which she addresses to her God, and our God, what Heaven has bestowed upon us, not through her merits, but through his mercy: the graces of that Redeemer whom she gave us, by his vouchsafing to be born of her. But your garbler ought not to have concealed the fact, that this very article and the preceding referred to that on "her conception," and thereby it was more fully explained. The article is the following:

On the Conception of the Blessed Virgin. "The conception of the Blessed Virgin is celebrated in memory of the inestimable privilege granted her, in being conceived in original justice, and in being exempted from all sin; the Son of God would not permit her in whose womb he was himself to be conceived, and who was to bear him nine months, to be for a single instant contaminated with the stain of sin: at the same time he gave her existence, he infused grace into her soul: and thereby he has been far more perfectly her Saviour, than if in order to deliver her from sin, he had waited until she was sullied with it. The Church in this Feast congratulates with Mary on this inestimable privilege, which is peculiar to her, and which renders her so similar to her divine Son. In this feast we should ask, through the intercession of the immaculate Virgin, for perfect purity of soul and body."

In this, it is true, she is said to have been rendered in some manner similar to her divine Son. But in Mary it was a privilege conferred by her Son, before his incarnation, by which he infused grace into her soul, became her Saviour, and making her free from sin, made her like to him in holiness derived from him. This is far from giving to her the worship due only to him.

The next proof in paragraph 13, is, that in the article on the annunciation, we are told in the last two lines, not to cease soliciting the protection of the mother of God,—evidently by asking her to pray for us:—for the petition is the following, "Holy Mary, Mother of God! pray for us, sinners, now, and at the hour of our death, Amen."

I cannot see how the 14th paragraph can establish the guilt of idolatry against any person, for the averment is, that the writer says Jesus Christ made use of Mary as an instrument through whom he might distribute his graces. I believe that Jesus Christ distributed graces through the instrumentality of St. Paul. I do not therefore adore St. Paul, as I adore our Saviour. Is the difficulty in the phrase, avail himself of his holy mother?—If the writer meant to say that Christ could not do it without her, I condemn him, and so will the Catholic Church. Here is, therefore, no idolatry.

The next proof is in paragraph 15. Is it idolatry to call persons the faithful servants of Mary? If by faithful servant it is meant to insinuate that the same service is due to her as is due to God, I condemn

the phrase, and so would the Catholic Church. But, dear gentlemen, I trust you will not imagine I intend to adore you, because I have the honour, so frequently to subscribe myself your obedient, humble servant. —No, no, you may feel quite convinced that B. C. does not look upon you as invested with the qualities of the Deity. Hence to say that they are the faithful servants of Mary, is not idolatry, neither is it adoring her, to say that she offered the sacrifice of her homage, her resignation, her sufferings, and her feelings, together with that of her beloved Son, to the eternal Father, at the foot of the cross of Jesus. It would afford me, callous wretch that I am! more consolation to unite in spirit with Holy Mary, in that moment of affliction, than to possess all the misapplied subtlety, which her ingenious and immitigable opponents have ever exhibited in their extraordinarily persevering efforts to strip her of that glory which her Son conferred upon her, under the pretext of saving all their homage for himself. The glow of fanaticism, and the fervour of superstition are indeed bad; but either is preferable to the cold heart which would not feel sympathy with the afflicted mother of the suffering Redeemer; and to feel and to express this sympathy is idolatry!— Bless the genius of your philosophical correspondent!

When to assert that God bestows a crown of glory upon one who has fought the good fight, will be lawfully marked as idolatry, we must, however reluctantly, acknowledge St. Paul to be an idolater, or at all events that they who believe in the fact declared in his *Second Epistle to Timothy*, iv. 8, are idolaters. I, for one, do not think they are made so by that belief; neither is it idolatry to assert that honour is due to those whom God highly favours, (Prot. version, *Luke* i. 28), provided this homage of honour be not what is due only to God; neither is it idolatry for each of us to love the mother of Jesus, and to address her by that endearing appellation which Christ himself desired his beloved disciple to use towards his afflicted, and venerable, and Holy Mother. (*John* xix. 26, 27).

Thus, I have unnecessarily undertaken to show, that in this private, ephemeral, and unauthorized publication, which is anything but a public document, there is not a single expression savouring of idolatry, though the examination has indeed made me feel serious pain, indevout as I am, at the callous, irreverent, and tortuous fallacy of your inexorable and inconsistent correspondent.

But he has other proofs of the downright idolatry, paragraph 17. And, gentlemen, this is no private compilation.—Yea, it is from the very *Missal*, she is called Holy! ! ! Now there can be no question of the downright idolatry! ! !—Then the Holy Ghost inspired Zachary with an

idolatrous sentiment when he declared that it was part of God's oath that the descendants of Abraham, of whom Mary was one, should serve him in holiness. (*Luke* i. 75). St. Paul leads us to most idolatrous notions, when he tells the Ephesians, (iv. 24), "to put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Equally wrong was it for this Apostle to pray for the Thessalonians, (1, iii. 13), that the Lord may establish their hearts unblamable in holiness, before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all the saints." And what is the word saint, but the more literal and ancient translation of *sanctus*, holy? Did not God himself command the Israelites, (*Exod.* xxii. 31), "And ye shall be holy men unto me?" Did you read of the holy angels? (*Mark* viii. 38). But why waste time and ink and paper, on such folly as this? Again the *Missal* styles her *Mother of God.* Good gentlemen! are my eyes deceived? Will Protestant Episcopalians leave us no choice between idolatry and Nestorianism? Are you prepared for the result?—And she is asked to intercede for us. Nothing more certain: that fact is fully admitted. This is therefore downright idolatry. By no means: quite the contrary; it is an acknowledgment and declaration that she must pray to a greater being than herself; to her God, who is also our God!

The passage from the *Christian's Guide* goes no farther, and is not idolatry.

In paragraph 19, the good man's zeal outsteps his premises.—"Now such language of adoration." Softly, good sir. We have examined every syllable of it, and not one syllable was the language of adoration. Adoration is the worship due to God. This is what we call misrepresentation, "and prayer." Yes, in the lesser sense, "invoking her, asking her aid," by her prayers to God for us, as you ask your friends in the body to pray for you, but not prayer of adoration, such as we address to God, who alone is the fountain and source of mercy. Thus we do say that Holy Mary, the mother of God, ever glorious virgin, is but a creature, and ought not to receive the homage due to the Creator alone: and we do not pay it to her, and thus we do not commit downright idolatry, though your "Protestant Catholic" has been guilty of various sad representations, and has most unmercifully outraged logic.

Roman Catholics condemn as heretics the Collyridians mentioned by St. Epiphanius, who were cut off from our communion, because of their paying an idolatrous homage to the blessed Virgin. This fact speaks sufficiently strong, to show that we neither practise nor approve the crime which your correspondent would fasten upon us.

The nineteenth paragraph states that our doctrine cannot be true,

without giving to the blessed Virgin (I may add, each of the saints,) "the divine attributes of omniscience and omnipresence." I can, upon a variety of grounds, cut short any disquisition, by a denial of such a consequence. The first ground I shall take, is that founded upon the indisputable distinction between the extent of this globe and the immensity of space. A being whose view would reach to a great extent, is not therefore said to see through all space; and our globe, from which Christian people send forth their prayers, is but a speck in the midst of creation. It is great in relation to us; but how small is it in relation to him whose eye pervades the boundless recesses of that space, through so small a portion of which the first rays of our sun have as yet travelled? These big words, omniscience and omnipresence, are thoughtlessly and incautiously used. God alone is omniscient and omnipresent; but as man is raised above the brute in knowledge, and as man excels man in science, so angelic natures exceed ours; neither can we comprehend, much less fix the boundary which God has placed to their powers of intuition. Spiritual beings as they are, we know that it is not with the eye they see, nor with the ear they hear; we know not how they move, if motion they have; nor how, if at all, they correspond to space. We live in a material world: we know that it differs from the world of spirits, in which angels and saints exist; and besides the blunder of extending our conclusions to all extent, from our premises, which only took considerable extent, shall we be guilty of the attempt to argue upon principles of analogy, regarding things where no foundation for analogy exists? Shall we argue from our imperfect experience in this material world, in which we live, and of which we know so little, to a spiritual world, of which we have no experience, and concerning which so little is known? This is not only illogical, but presumptuous. The nature of the saints reigning together with Christ in heaven, is at present altogether spiritual, and even when their bodies will arise in the ressurrection; even then, the attributes of those bodies shall be like to those of the blessed spirits, the angelic substances. This is the testimony of Christ.

"And Jesus answering, said to them: Do ye not therefore err, not understanding the Scriptures, nor the power of God?

"For when they shall rise again from the dead, they shall neither marry, nor be given in marriage; but are as the angels in heaven.

"And as concerning the dead, that they rise again, have you not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spoke to him, saying: I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?

"He is not the God of the dead, but of the living. You therefore do greatly err." (*Mark xii.* 24, 25, 26, 27).

An extended view is not omnipresence, neither is extensive knowledge omniscience; extended views and knowledge are required, by our doctrine, in these spirits, but omnipresence and omniscience are not. I do not advert to the scriptural facts which exhibit full evidence of the existence of what our tenets necessarily suppose: but I thus at once show that the assumed conclusions in this nineteenth paragraph are perfectly unfounded.

Not only is there a total want of correct reasoning, but there is in the assumption a principle which will of course overthrow many of the Scriptural doctrines of your own church; for you believe that the angels in heaven do know and rejoice at the conversion of sinners, who may at the same instant repent in various parts of our circumscribed globe. (*Luke* xv. 7, 10). You also do believe that the devil, who is neither omniscient nor omnipresent, tempts people in all parts of the world, at the same time that he is their accuser before the throne of God. (*Revel.* xii. 9, 10; *Ephes.* iv. 27; vi. 11; *I Tim.* iii. 6, 7; *II Tim.* ii. 26; *James* iv. 7, and so forth). As I am at present merely on the defensive, I consider it unnecessary for me to adduce those texts and reasons that would establish the facts upon which our doctrine rests. I shall therefore content myself with showing, as I trust I have done, that the gentleman with the curious name has altogether failed in his efforts to maintain his positions; that he has treated our documents with manifest dishonesty, and altogether misrepresented our tenets, in his first essay, wherein he undertook to adduce sufficient evidence to prove that I asserted what was not true, when I stated it to be a misrepresentation to charge us with "praying to angels and saints to save us by their merits," "making those angels and saints mediators with Christ, or in his stead; thus dishonouring Christ, the only mediator," and "giving to creatures the worship due to God alone," and "thus being guilty of downright idolatry."

I shall proceed to consider his second essay in my next, and remain, gentlemen, without any intention of adoring you,

Your obedient, humble servant,

B. C.

LETTER VI.

A most compendious way, and civil
At once to cheat the world, the devil,
And heaven, and hell, yourselves, and those
On whom you vainly think t' impose.
Why then (quoth he) may hell surprise.
That trick, (said she) will not pass twice:
I've learned how far I'm to believe
Your pinning oaths upon your sleeve.
But there's a better way of clearing
What you would prove, than downright swearing.

BUTLER, *Hudibras*. Part iii. c. 1.

CHARLESTON, S. C., June 6, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—There is no subject upon which greater injustice has been done to us than on the worship of images. There are serious differences in matters of fact, and there is a great difference in principle upon this subject between several Protestants and the Roman Catholic Church; I say several Protestants, because I do not find the Protestants, as a body, of the same opinion regarding the principle; nor do I find them, by any means, unanimous as to the statement of facts. The chief object is, therefore, to understand what our present opponent looks upon to be erroneous. At first view it would appear to be easily solved, by saying that he looked upon idolatry to be erroneous. But this answer leaves us as completely as ever at a loss; for, perhaps, we are not agreed as to the meaning of the word itself, nor are our opponents agreed amongst themselves upon this point. For instance, some of them will say that, to pay any respect whatever to an image, is idolatry; whilst others state, that, if the image be considered only as a memorial, by means of which the mind is brought to worship the Creator, whom it represents, it is not idolatry; for it is God, and not the image, that is worshipped. A third class will assert, that, to make anything as a likeness or image of the Creator, is, in itself, highly criminal, and is idolatry. These are some, but not all the varieties of opinion amongst Protestants.

Again, they differ in their statement of facts; for, whilst some of them admit that we do not adore images, others assert that we do adore them. And again, whilst we meet with some who admit that there might and do exist various degrees of religious homage, which may be all designated by the name of worship, and the highest of which (adoration) is that which is due to God alone—we meet with many who under-

take to say, that all religious homage is adoration, and that there cannot be any graduations of worship; that, in fact, worship is an indivisible point, in which there cannot be higher and lower.

From this view, it will be pretty clear, that the subject has been rendered more difficult, confused, and intricate than might at first seem. But as I have to deal with an individual, I consider it to be my duty to endeavour, first, to ascertain how far he agrees with me in principle, and in fact; and not to make him accountable for the opinions of other Protestants.

In the first place, I believe he admits as a fact, that the worship which the Roman Catholic Church permits to be paid to images is not of the same sort as that which she states is due only to God. My ground for this assertion is the following passage in his second essay (for March), paragraph 23:

"Christians under the denomination of Roman Catholics, like other Christians, worship the one true God of the Scriptures. But their Church has authorized a use of images in their places of worship, that would make a certain kind of worship paid to them consistent with the purer and exclusive homage which Jehovah demands for himself."

Thus, he admits that there are degrees of worship, the purer and exclusive homage of Jehovah, and a certain kind of worship paid to images. The former is called by Roman Catholics adoration, and is given exclusively to the one true God of the Scriptures; the other is not adoration, but a certain kind of different worship paid to images. I shall always, upon this subject, use the word adoration in the meaning which is here affixed by me to it; such, also, is the meaning in which it is understood by all Roman Catholics using the English language. In a preceding part of the same paragraph, he has the following expression of his opinions:

"It may be true, that some Protestants, in an intemperate zeal of dissent from Popery, have considered Roman Catholics equally as idolatrous as the heathens either are or were. I believe, however, that a wide distinction is generally considered due in favour of Christian worshippers of the one only God, however incumbered their worship may be with erroneous appendages, from those, who, with no knowledge or belief of the one Jehovah, may worship infinitely various fictitious dieties, in idols, in which they may be supposed to reside."

From this I infer that he does not consider Roman Catholics to be polytheists, since they are worshippers of the "one only God," "the one true God of the Scriptures," whom they worship with "the purer and exclusive homage" of adoration; this they pay to God alone, and they have no other God but him; though your correspondent considers their worship to be "encumbered with erroneous appendages," such as "a certain kind of worship paid to images." In this passage he also

draws "a wide distinction between" "those Christian" Roman Catholic "worshippers of the one only God," and the persons who, "with no knowledge or belief on the *one Jehovah*, may worship" "fictitious deities, in idols, in which they may be supposed to reside." These we may safely call idolaters. In a subsequent passage of the paragraph he again states, that there is an "important" "difference" between the Roman Catholics who pay adoration to the one true God of the Scriptures, and the idolater who "either honoured his idols with a worship terminating in them, or through them worshipped the unknown God."

"Voltaire, it is true, thought the heathens were no more idolaters than Roman Catholics. I would not, however, take his authority as good, against the industrious author of the essay, in the *Review*. There is a difference, and we should admit that it is important. The poor Indian either honoured his idols with a worship terminating in them, or, through them, worshipped the unknown God."

The author of the essay, he had previously adverted to in this passage—

"The author of an article in the fourth number of the *Southern Review* has, with needless elaborateness of detail, given the literary and political community, for whom that work is intended, reasons to believe, that the idolatry of the aborigines of America is a very different thing from the Roman Catholic reverence or adoration of images."

From this passage it would appear that the author of that article [67] in the *Review* stated that Roman Catholics paid "*adoration*" to images. I have very carefully perused the article, and can distinctly aver that the author says no such thing. It is a little unpleasant to be obliged to exhibit those peccadilloes, and is, moreover, somewhat troublesome to me, since it puts it out of my power to rely on the assertion of your correspondent. However, I am not, perhaps, warranted in using this language; for if, by adoration, he means [a] "certain kind of worship, quite different from that which is given exclusively to Jehovah, the only true God of the Scriptures," it is not impossible but the author of that essay did admit that Roman Catholics paid such adoration to images, though he never used the expression either in phrase or in substance: or, perhaps, some other curiously baptized correspondent will prove the point against him in your number for August. The article has, I believe, been rather unsparingly commented upon, because of the following passage:

"Another passage in the letter exhibits to us the grounds upon which we are fully warranted in calling their (the Indians') worship idolatrous. Idolatry is the giving to any created being the worship of adoration which is due to God alone. The person who acknowledged the existence of only one God, and paid to him adoration under any name by which he might be designated, would not be an idolater,

[67] See *Essay on the Religion of the N. Am. Indians.*

because the object of his adoration was the supreme and only God. The person who believed the divinity to reside in a statue or image, and therefore made that statue or image the object of his adoration, would be an idolater; but if he viewed that image as it really was, not divine, nor partaking of the divinity, nor having any inherent sanctity, but a mere memorial by which his attention was awakened, his imagination fixed, and his religious feeling excited, and that in its presence he adored the eternal and spiritual God, and him alone—clearly he was not an idolater: for though, by occasion of the creature, he was brought to the adoration of the Creator, he adored God, and him alone. Thus he who, filled with the piety which nature excites, raises himself from the contemplation of a flower, or the consideration of the solar system, to the adoration of Him who gave to the one its delicate tints, and to the other its admirable order and wondrous harmony, is not the adorer of nature, but of nature's God. He who pays the homage of adoration to created beings, however intelligent and superior they may be, whether they be holy or wicked, gives to the creature that which is due to the Creator alone, and is thus an idolater: thus, the worshippers of Mars, of Juno, of Ceres, and the other deities of Greece and Rome, gave to created beings the homage of adoration, and were idolaters; and though they should never have represented by statues or painting those objects of their homage, the crime would have been fully committed; the adoration of those demons, by occasion and in presence of the image, was still the undue worship of creatures, and they who were so far besotted as to adore the statue itself, were, if possible, more criminal. The adhering to this idolatry so far as to withdraw its votaries from the adoration of the only and true God, would have been the consummation of this apostacy; and such was the state of the Indians of whom we treat. The Manitou is not considered as an intercessor with God, as a fellow-worshipper with man of the Deity, but is the object of adoration, the lord of life and of death."

The article was considered by several with whom I spoke, to have been obnoxious, for an additional reason: because there was a general impression that it came from the pen of a writer who is supposed to believe, that the kindness of his fellow-citizens has more than compensated for the hostility of unappeasable opponents. But, so far as I can observe, there is not throughout the whole article a single averment respecting Roman Catholic adoration of images, or Roman Catholic veneration of images, unless it be contained in the above paragraph, which another religious writer has proclaimed to be destructive of Christianity.

How far it is "needlessly elaborate," touches not the present question; but, it appears to me, only to do what your correspondent, and all other writers of his description, have been grossly deficient in omitting, to give some distinct notion of what is meant by the word idolatry, previously to charging millions of accountable beings with the practice of "abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man."—(*Homil.*)

In the same twenty-third paragraph, your correspondent, after giving pretty correctly the passage from the creed of the Roman Cath-

olic Church, set forth by Pope Pius IV., in fulfilment of the order of the Council of Trent, favours his readers with a piece of Latin, which he calls "the words of the decree of the Council of Trent," but which is a garbled imitation, instead of being "the words of the decree." Although some of the printed words are nonsense, and there is a transposition of a point, which would make the original appear to place the worship of Christ and the saints upon an equal footing: yet the translation which he gives, is better in keeping with the spirit of the decree; though still, in that translation, the point is not introduced, and the distinction between the adoration of Christ, and the veneration of the saints, is not so strongly marked as it is in the original. Upon this, however, I shall not rest an argument. God forbid I should be driven to the wretched shift of endeavouring to sustain a calumny upon, perhaps, a printer's mistake. From all this, he states:

"Now, the honour and veneration of the images of Christ, and so forth, thus provided for by the highest authority of the Roman Catholic Church, as indispensably obligatory, we know to be held and taught in that church, to be not such as is due to God.

"The second Council of Nice, A. D. 786, which is referred to by the Council of Trent, on this subject, did assert the direct worship of images; declaring, at the same time, that it should not be Latria, which is due only to God, but merely an honorary adoration."

Hence, we have the writer's testimony, or admission, for the following points:

First. That Roman Catholics pay to the one only God of the Scriptures, a purer worship than they pay to any other being.

Second. That the worship that they pay to this God, is a kind which is given exclusively to him, and which we call adoration, to distinguish it from any other.

Third. That they admit a certain kind of worship to be paid to images, which is very different from that which they give exclusively to God, and which they assert is consistent with giving that purer and exclusive worship of adoration to God alone.

Fourth. That there are different and distinct degrees of religious worship.

Fifth. That however erroneous Roman Catholics may be, in their appendages of the worship of one only God, of which the worship of images is one, there is a wide distinction to be taken between them and those who worship fictitious deities, in idols in which they may be supposed to reside.

Sixth. That Roman Catholics are not polytheists, for they believe in the existence of only one God, to whom, exclusively, they pay adoration.

Seventh. That there exists an important difference between Roman Catholics, who pay to images a certain kind of worship, and idolaters, who give to their idols a worship terminating in those idols.

Eighth. As also between Roman Catholics and those idolaters, who through their idols worshipped the unknown God.

Ninth. That Roman Catholics do not believe any divinity to reside in their images.

Tenth. That they do not believe any power to reside in the images.

Eleventh. That the honour which is shown to the images of Christ, is referred to the original, so that through the image Christ is adored by Catholics.

Twelfth. That through the images of the saints, Roman Catholics venerate the saints whose similitude the images bear, so that the honour shown to the image, is referred to the original.

Upon these twelve points, the author of the essay and I appear to be perfectly agreed: but I must correct a mistake of his, in the passage just quoted last above, where he asserts that this honour and veneration of the images, and so forth, is "indispensably obligatory." Such is not the fact, nor is such a provision made. A person might be, during all his life, a member of the Roman Catholic Church, and never be obliged to pay either honour or veneration to any image: but he would cease to be a member of the church, by deliberately denying that it was lawful to pay due honour and veneration to eitheer the images of Christ, or of the saints. Should he assert that they ought to be adored, in the sense in which I use the word, he would also cease to belong to the church, for he would assert idolatry, or that undue honour should be given to them. Every Catholic is bound to believe the true doctrine; but every Catholic is not "indispensably obliged" to practise every religious duty which he may lawfully practise, if he pleases. Your correspondent is very liable to mistakes.

I remarked before, upon the garbled extract which was given to us by the writer, as "the words of the decree of the Council of Trent, enacted at its twenty-fifth session," upon this subject. In a note to paragraph 23, he is pleased to state, that, for those decrees, Father Paul's history is his authority; he is, moreover, pleased to assert, that neither Mr. Charles Butler, nor B. C., can make good their insinuations against the correctness of that history: and especially asserts, that "it cannot be shown that Father Paul has not correctly reported the decrees

passed by this Council." He states that, several years ago, he did himself look over them in Pallavicini's work; and believes that, in this respect, there is no *material* difference." He then insinuates, that Pallavicini might be biassed to the Catholic side, and then confirms the whole by adducing, in support of the correctness of Father Paul, "an attested copy of the original acts of the Council," preserved in the library of Cambridge University, in England.

Now, the question is not, by any means, as to whether either of those writers, Father Paul, or Pallavicini, gave a correct history of the proceedings, debates, and, if it pleases you, the intrigues at the Council; the question is a far more simple one, and much more easily decided: whether the extract given by your correspondent, contains "the words of the decree?" A decree is a public document, every word of which should be given, when quoted, as "the words;" and then the suppression of any portion of "the words," is the most unpardonable dishonesty. When I saw your "Protestant Catholic's" note, before I read the decree, my suspicions were excited, and I began to consider why such stress was laid upon proving, what no person would be disposed to call in question, that the public document was correctly given. I next observed, that even your curiously named friend manifested extreme caution in asserting that the documents were reported in the same words in both historians, for he would only vouch upon a distant recollection of several years, and to there being, in this respect, no *material* difference. But, why should there be any difference, if they were both honest? They had only to copy the words of a public document. Then, as if the writer was fully aware that a difference would be discovered, he prepares his readers to distrust Pallavicini, and next he proceeds to strengthen Father Paul. It was now too manifest to me, that your correspondent was aware of a difference in the document, as given by each of the historians. Was it, here honest in him to quote as unquestioned, a doubtful document?

It is one of the best principles of evidence that no secondary testimony shall be admitted when primary testimony can be had; and it is also a practical maxim that secondary testimony, even when admitted, shall not weigh as much as that which is primary. Both those historians are secondary witnesses. An attempt is next made by him, it is true, to give us primary testimony, but at second hand; an attested copy through Dr. Marsh. The attested copy might be correct and Dr. Marsh might be misquoted; this I state not to insinuate that he did, but to illustrate my position; therefore, this statement of your correspondent gives us no primary testimony. The attested copy would be testimony of this description, not in its strictest, but in its usual and practical

meaning. What is an attested copy? One testified to be correct, by a public officer who is solemnly bound, and trustworthy, and having the means of ascertaining its correctneess fully in his power. Let us apply this to the Cambridge copy. Upon the very face of the case it is difficult to believe it to be what your correspondent says. Because at the very time of the session of the Council, the laws of England prohibited under the most severe penalties, any intercourse with the only officers of the See of Rome who could give the attestation: and the See of Rome had excommunicated the persons who were the officers of the University authorized to receive and to preserve the copy. To suppose the fact, then, we must first suppose the officers on both sides to have disobeyed and violated the laws of their respective governments. Even at this day, though Catholics are emancipated, an officer of the University of Cambridge could not legally receive any official document from an officer of the See of Rome.

But, gentlemen, authenticated copies of the public acts and decrees of the Council of Trent are by no means scarce, and two of them, of different editions, now lie before me, one of which I shall leave at the *Miscellany* office, during a week from the publication of this letter, so that any person who thinks proper may satisfy himself of the correctness of the quoted decree.

I shall not then give Pallavicini against Father Paul; but I shall give primary evidence, by giving from an authenticated copy of the acts of the Council, "the very words of the decree," taken from an edition printed at Trent in 1745, with the regular testimonies and licenses, and moreover found to agree, upon comparison, with the various quotations and transcripts in all public documents and standard works which regarded the same topics, printed in several Catholic countries, and with various other authenticated printed copies of the acts of the Council published in other places.

Extract from the Decree of the Council of Trent, concerning the invocation, and veneration and relics of Saints, and concerning sacred images, passed in the 25th Session, celebrated on the 3d and 4th days of December, 1563.

"*Imagines* porro *Christi*, Deiparæ *Virginis*, et aliorum, *sanctorum, in templis* præsertim habendas, et *retinendas, eisque debitum honorem*, et venerationem *impertiendam, non quod* credatur *inesse* aliqua *in eis Divinitas, vel virtus*, propter quam sint colendæ; vel quod ab eis sit aliquid petendum, vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda: veluti olim fiebat a Gentibus, quæ in idolis spem suam collocabant; *sed quoniam honos, qui eis exhibetur refertur ad prototypa*, quæ illæ representant: *ita ut per imagines*, quas osculamur, et coram quibus caput aperimus et procumbimus *Christum adoramus, et Sanctos, quorum* illæ *similitudinem gerunt, venceremur*, id quod

Conciliorum, præsertim vero secundæ Nicenæ Synodi decretis contra imaginum oppugnatores est sancitum.''

TRANSLATION.—''*Moreover,* that the images of Christ, of the Virgin *Mother of God* and of *other* saints are to be *kept* and retained *especially* in the churches, and that due honour *and veneration* is to be given to them, not that *it is to be believed that* there is in them any divinity or power; *on account of which they are to be worshipped: or that any trust is to be placed in images, as was formerly done by the Gentiles who placed their hopes in idols;* but because the honour which is shown to them is referred to the originals *which they represent:* so that through the images, *which we kiss, and in presence of which we uncover our heads and kneel down,* we might adore Christ, and might venerate the saints, whose likeness they bear, *that which has been sanctioned by the decrees of councils, but especially of the second Council of Nice against the opposers of images.*''

In this extract I have marked in *italic letters* the parts omitted by this man, who with such effrontery declared that ''it cannot be shown that Father Paul has not correctly reported the decrees passed by this Council! ! !'' Be it remembered, that the object of this writer was to show, that there was no misrepresentation in charging Roman Catholics with adoring images, in like manner as the pagans did; and that in several Protestant writers, the overt acts, of kissing, uncovering the head, and kneeling, are relied upon as evidence of the intention of adoration. Then look at the parts omitted, and say if this was not flagrant, unjustifiable garbling.

There is, however, great difference between even Father Paul and your correspondent. The former did not undertake nor profess to give ''the words of the decree;'' he had more prudence that to expose himself to the necessary result. This writer could not then have stated with truth that he took the ''words of the decree'' from the historian, who did not profess to give them. Father Paul wrote in Italian, and his work was translated into English by Sir Nathaniel Brent. I have not seen an Italian copy, but I presume the English to be correct, as both the original and the translation were procured to be made and printed by the English government. The translation gives no Latin words of the decrees, which were written in Latin. I suppose, therefore, the Italian original gave none: where then did your correspondent get the Latin which he gives? It is evidently taken from the Latin of the original decree, for the words, so far as they are given, are the same; yet Father Paul does not give this Latin; therefore it was not copied from him: neither is the English that of his translators, which is the following:—

''Concerning images, that those of Christ, of the Virgin, and of the saints, ought to be kept in the churches, and to have due honour given them; not that there is any divinity or virtue in them, but because the honour redoundeth to the thing

represented, Christ and the saints being worshipped by the images, whose similitude they bear; as has been defined by the Councils, especially in the second of Nice." (London MDCLXXVI. p. 751).

Where then did your correspondent get either his Latin or his English? For it is pretty clear he got [them] neither from Father Paul, nor from Sir Nathaniel Brent. Perhaps Dr. Marsh helped him from the attested copy of the original acts, out of which in the process of time, the moths had eaten a few words. But it is for your veracious correspondent to say why he fathered the "words of the decree" upon Father Paul, who was too cunning to lay himself open to such exposure. Perhaps you can make another point of this.

I am, gentlemen,

Your obedient, humble servant,

B. C.

LETTER VII.

Tum vero ardemus scitari, et quærere causas,
Ignari scelerum tantorum, artisque Pelasgæ.
Prosequitur pavitans, et ficto pectore fatur.

VIRGIL, *Aeneid II.*

Now blind to Grecian frauds, we burn to know
With fond desire the causes of his wo;
Who thus, still trembling as he stood, and pale
Pursued the moving melancholy tale.

PITT'S *Translation.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., June 13, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—It is an extremely unpleasant task to come in contact with a writer like "Protestant Catholic," not so much because of his amusing name, but because of his multiplied errors. Leaving him to settle his differences with Father Paul, in the best way that he can, I now must confront him with St. Thomas.

He tells us in the same paragraph, 23, concerning this holy Doctor,—

"Thomas Aquinas, who wrote several centuries after the second Nicene Council, asserted for the images of Christ, and so forth, placed in the churches, the direct worship of Latria; alleging that the same acts and degrees of worship, which were due to the original, were also due to the image; on the ground, that to worship the image with any other act than that by which the original was worshipped, was to worship it on its own account, which is idolatry."

They who are acquainted with the works of the angelic Doctor of the schools, will find this subject treated in his *Summa Theologioe*, part iii. quæst xxv., artiele 3. *Utrum imago Christi sit adoranda, adorantione*

latroe. I shall leave this work at the *Miscellany* Office, during the week from the day of publication of this letter, and it will be seen by any person who chooses to refer to the article, that the above extract contains five distinct untruths; for in the first place, Thomas Aquinas does not assert for the images the direct worship of Latria; in the next place, he does not give the ground here alleged, but others of a description by no means like it; nor does he state that it would be idolatry to worship the image with any other act than that with which the original was worshipped; nor does he assert that it would be idolatry to worship it on its own account; nor has he any passage which warrants the and so forth after the word Christ.

The ground upon which St. Thomas founded his proposition, is a philosophical, not a theological topic, and upon a principle laid down by Aristotle in the second chapter of his book *On Memory and Recollection*; which is in substance, that the image brings to the mind what it was formed to represent, and, that the mental acts regard not the materials which produce the recollection and excite the feelings, but the original object to which those recollections and feelings are directed: and St. Thomas, applying this principle to the images of Christ, says, that since the memory and devotion have Christ, and not the image for their object, the worship of adoration which is due to the Saviour might be indirectly paid to those objects.

Your notable correspondent then makees an attempt to place Cardinal Bellarmine in contradiction to Thomas Aquinas, and for that purpose makes the following statement.

"On the other hand, '*Ita ut ipsae terminent venerationem ut in se considerantur et non solum ut vicem gerunt exemplaris,*' the language of Bellarmine,[68] places this matter in a different, but still a very perplexing light. His object is to vindicate the Church from the reproach of worshipping images with the worship given to God. He assigns them, therefore, an inferior worship, which might be all their own. The difficulty is not thus removed."

In this reference he has very carefully quoted the Latin, and pointed out the place: the chapter, indeed, contains all the words that he quoted, but it contains others besides, which he does not give, and which he ought to have given, but which I shall take leave to supply.

Two authors writing upon the same subject and viewing it in the same manner, contradict each other, when one asserts exactly what the other denies. Cardinal Bellarmine treats of the same subjects as does St. Thomas. But in chapter xxi. of book ii., "On images," and so forth, the Cardinal considers them without their being so completely over-

[68] Bellarm. *De Imag.* 1, 2, c. 21.

looked, as that the mind of the observer is altogether occupied with the original which they represent. In part iii., quaest 25, article 3, St. Thomas considers them, the mind being altogether occupied with the originals, whose recollection they excite. They do not both here view the subject in the same manner; they do not in fact examine the same question. But in chapter xxiii. of the same second book, the Cardinal takes exactly the same question of which St. Thomas treats. If your correspondent were animated by a spirit of justice and candour, he would have found in this chapter the ground of comparison, and had he made it, he would have discovered agreement and not contradiction. Mark what Bellarmine writes in this chapter xxiii. After laying down his proposition, he gives the following as his first reason.

"*Ac primum, quod imago possit coli impropriè eo cultu, quo ipsum exemplar, probatur; nam aliquando imago accipitur pro ipso exemplari, et ea, quae fierent circa ipsum exemplar si adesset praesens, fiunt circa imaginem,* mente tamen defixa in exemplari. *Sic concionatores alloquuntur imaginem crucifixi, eique dicunt tu nos redemisti, tu nos Patri reconciliasti; ista enim non dicuntur imagini, nec ut lignum est, nec ut imago est, sed ut accipitur loco exemplaris, id est, dicuntur ipsi Christo, cujus tamen imago vicem gerit, quemadmodum etiam in die Parasceves cum crucifixus paulatim detegitur, et ostenditur, et adorandus proponitur, illa omnia per imaginem, ipsi Christo vero exhiberi intelliguntur, tunc autem propriè nullus honor defertur imagini, sed soli exemplari; tamen impropriè dici potest ipsa etiam imago honorari.*"

"And first, it is proved, that an image might be worshipped, not on its own account, with the same homage as the original, for sometimes, the image is looked upon as in place of the original itself; and the same things which would be done regarding that original, if it were present, are done regarding the image, *the mind being, however, fixed firmly upon the original.* Thus preachers address the image of him crucified, and say to it, 'Thou hast redeemed us, thou hast reconciled us to thy Father,' for these things are not said to the image, either as it is a piece of wood, or an image, but as it is looked upon as being in the place of the original, that is, they are said to Christ himself, whose place, however, that image holds; as also on Good Friday, when the crucifix is gradually uncovered, and exhibited for adoration; all those things are understood to be exhibited to Christ through the image: then indeed on its own account, no honour is paid to the image, but to the original only; but yet, though not on its own account, it might be said that the image is honoured."

He next proceeds to show that the mind is also frequently drawn through the image to the original, so that this latter only is viewed, not indeed as in the place of the first, but represented by it, and if clothed with the image: in such a case the image is adored; *per accidens tamen, quia ipsa nec est suppositum quod adoratur, nec ratio adorationis, sed quiddam adjunctum,* "indirectly, because it is not the object which is adored, nor the cause of adoration, but it is something joined to what is adored:" he gives as an example: when a king clothed with his robes

receives homage, the royal dignity is the cause of the respect, the person of the monarch is directly respected, and the robes are indirectly (*per accidens*) honoured, because they are so joined to him, that it is in them his person is seen. So that the adoration of Christ, through the image, is by some called an indirect adoration of the image itself, just as the homage paid to the wearer of the robes. is said to be an indirect homage of the robes themselves.

So far from contradicting St. Thomas, the Cardinal in this very chapter in the paragraph next but one after this latter explanation, mentions the opinion of this angelic writer, and after examining his statements, shows that this very explanation agrees with the position laid down in his work: and in chapter xxv., after stating the opinion of St. Thomas and other writers, as explained by Gabriel, he adds, *quod si ita est, omnes convenimus*, "but if this be so, we all agree."

Thus all our writers agree that when the mind is carried through the image to the original, the homage which is paid is directed exclusively to that original, and by no means whatever to the statute or image from which the mind received its impression and direction. The various modes of expression in different authors, must be construed by the general character of their age, and style, and education; there will frequently be found a difference of phrase, but not a difference of sentiment. Thus the Council of Trent viewing the subject in the same light agrees with both of those writers, when it states that "through the images" "we adore Christ, and venerate the saints whose likeness they bear."

But images might be considered in another light, viz., as they are memorials of their prototypes or originals. In this view they are more than their materials, but less than their originals: as the statute of General Washington, at Raleigh, is more than a mere block of marble, more than a mere work of art; but, certainly far less than the father of our country. No American, with well regulated feelings, would treat the Apollo Belvidere with equal attachment as he would this production of Canova, though as a work of art, the Apollo is more excellent. Place them side by side, and the citizen who looks with mere admiration at the one, will feel something like affection for the other. It was not a mere regard for the image as a work of art, but that regard blended with respect and love for the memory of the great original, that urged the legislature of North Carolina in 1821 to pass the following statute.

"Chapter 1088. An act making it an indictable offence to injure or deface the Statute of General Washington.

"*Be it enacted*, and so forth, That if any person or persons here-

inafter shall knowingly spit upon, or in any way stain or designedly injure, or in any manner deface the Statute of General Washington, erected by the General Assembly of this State, he, she, or they shall be guilty of an indictable offence, and, upon conviction, shall be fined and imprisoned at the discretion of the court before whom the trial may be had.''—Taylor's *Revisal.* page 18.

Thus family pictures and images, are memorials which naturally create a claim upon the affections, even viewed in themselvees and without actual recollection of their originals. Cardinal Bellarmine in chapter xxi. of book ii, views the images in this light, and says that as such, they do deserve from us properly and on their own account, as memorials of Christ, and so forth, a proper veneration: but not adoration, or *latria.* His proposition is in the following words; I print in Roman letters the parts omitted by your correspondent.

''Imagines Christi, et sanctorum venerandae sunt non solum per accidens, vel improprie, sed itiam per se proprie, *ita ut ipsae terminent venerationem, ut in se considerantur, et non solum ut vicem gerunt exemplaris.''*

''The images of Christ and of the saints are to be venerated not only indirectly, or improperly speaking, but properly on their own account: *so as that the veneration terminates in them, considered as what they really are, and not only as they hold the place of the originals.''*

In this light also, as the Cardinal remarks, they were viewed by the second Council of Nice when it forbid them to be worshipped with *latria* or adoration; but stated that they ought to be venerated with the same respect which is paid to the book of the gospels, to the holy vessels, such as the chalice, the pix, and so forth. Such as was paid to the ark of the covenant with the images of cherubim, and so forth, in the old law. Yet, still, in the same chapter, Bellarmine remarks, that the veneration paid to the image is because of the sanctity of the original, so that though respect be directly given to the representation, its cause is found in what is represented. If you will take the trouble of looking into St. Thomas 2nda 2æ. quæst. article ii., you will find that he takes a wide distinction between the images of Christ and those of the saints; and keeping this distinction in mind, turn over to 3tia. quest. xxv. article iii., for the image of Christ, and article v., for the principle respecting the images of the saints, by analogy from the answers regarding their relics,—you will find how completely he agrees with Bellarmine, and with the second Council of Nice, which was held 540 years before his birth, and with the Council of Trent, which was assembled about 260 years after his death.

I shall now state our doctrine, which your correspondent has endeavoured to perplex. 1. Christ ought to be adored, because he is God. 2. The saints are not to be adored, for they are not Gods.

3. But as the holy friends of God, they deserve from us the homage of our religious respect, honour, and esteem. 4. An image of Christ, or of a saint has no inherent sanctity, yet viewed as a memorial of Christ or of the saint, it, on that account, derives from its connexion with the original which it represents, an intrinsic value which makes it venerable and respectable; yet it is not when viewed in that light to receive the same homage, that the original deserves. 5. But it frequently happens that in contemplating the image, the mind is carried altogether to the original, and the homage due to Christ or to the saint is then paid directly to our Redeemer, or to his friend, but through the image, which is, thus indirectly to receive the homage due to the original. Such is the doctrine of the two councils and the two writers whom "Protestant Catholic" has misrepresented. It is very easy for a man to create confusion, and then to complain of its existence. Such has been the unbecoming conduct of the writer who complains of a "perplexing light" produced by his own shiftings.

But I have not yet cleared away all his misrepresentations, in this second essay. In paragraph 24, he confines himself to "the images *or pictures* of the Virgin *Mary,* and other Saints." And this he inserts within crotchets, as if it were a quotation. From what does he quote it? The creed of Pope Pius has, even upon his own showing, in paragraph 23, "the images *of Christ* of the *Mother of God, ever* Virgin, and *of the* other saints." I have marked in *italics* in each phrase, the words omitted in the other. Could it be from what he calls "the words of the decree?" I shall exhibit his crotcheted sentence and what he says he copied from Father Paul, "the images or *pictures* of the Virgin Mary and *other* saints"—"the images of *Christ*, the Virgin Mary and *the* saints." Father Paul omitted the word *other* before saints, that he might leave room thus to exhibit us as believing that the blessed Virgin was not one of that class: when it suited your curious correspondent's purpose in giving "the words of the decree" he omits it, I should suppose for the same object: but now, in paragraph 24, he seeks another object to attain which that word *other* is introduced, and the word *Christ* is ommitted. I shall now state facts, and I think I need scarcely make an inference to exhibit the dishonesty of intention.

In paragraph 23, the writer states that "Thomas Aquinas asserted for the images of Christ, and so forth, placed in churches the direct worship of *Latria*," *the and so forth*, placed after the word Christ evidently conveys an idea of some adjunct, and the reader naturally asks what that adjunct is. And as naturally concludes it must be what followed the word *Christ* in the two former passages which is, "of the

Virgin Mary and the saints," so that without printing the proposition at full length, the *and so forth* leads him to believe that Thomas Aquinas asserted the direct worship of Latria for the images not only of Christ, but also of the Virgin and of the other saints. With this fact before the reader, it now becomes necessary to inform him, that so far from making this assertion, St. Thomas of Aquin distinctly excludes the images of the saints from that worship which he asserts for the images of Christ! ! There was a great clamour raised in England, in 1640, about the insidious nature of an *and so forth* which the convocation introduced in their sixth canon, at the end of a clause in an oath tendered to the clergy; of which the poet Cleveland writes:

"I cannot half untruss
Et coetera, it is so abominous."

In paragraph 24, omitting all mention of the images of Christ, he merely mentions what his *and so forth* unwarrantably introduced, together with what he now introduces for the first time, pictures, and he asserts that to "the images or pictures of the Virgin Mary, and other saints," "we are required to give in our churches" "due honour and veneration," and the religious honour due to them is by some of our own writers considered to be Latria, *honor sive cultus soli Deo exhibendus*, "the worship or honour due to God alone." Not one of our writers ever was guilty of such blasphemous nonsense. And yet I have little doubt but that the person who had the hardihood, and so forth . . . . to publish this, is looked upon as a holy and zealous man! ! ! The miserable little compilation, which gave rise to this discussion, was innocence itself when compared with a production like this. Mark the gross folly which is imputed to us! We are made to say that *Latria*, "adoration" is due only to God, and in the same breath to say that it is due also to the image of a saint!! I feel degraded at being brought to examine such a libel upon common sense, as well as upon common religion, and common honesty. I address you as gentlemen; Editors of the *Gospel Messenger*, do you not blush at having permitted this to soil your pages?

His next assertion is, that others of our writers state, that this religious honour due to "the images or pictures of the Virgin Mary, and other saints" is *dulia*, or the honour, or worship, or service, which is paid to man by reason of some dignity, holiness, virtue or goodness: or, as the words of Aquinas thus literally rendered, define it, *honor, vel cultus, vel servitus quae exhibetur homini, ratione alicujus dignitatis, sanctitatis, virtutis, vel bonitatis.*

Who those other writers are, he does not state. Yet I shall not therefore say he has invented it. I have no hesitation in admitting that

what he describes as *dulia*, is such homage as we believe might be lawfully paid to the saints; and that, if not the image itself, but the saint through the image, be considered, this assertion of his might be admitted; and in this sense some of our writers do allow it can be used. I shall also state, that I cannot find in the Sum of St. Thomas, which I have carefully examined, that definition of *dulia* which he exhibits as "the words of Aquinas, thus literally rendered define it." Yet I admit it to be sufficiently correct. As his edition of Thomas Aquinas differs so widely from those to which I have recourse, I shall describe these latter. One is a thick folio, 1 vol., Parisiis, mdcxxxix, and the other 18 volumes, 12mo, Patavii, mdcclx.

In paragraph 25, he appears to stand upon more solid ground. He had hitherto been only constructing gradually what he now rests upon with confidence. "In his adoration, then, this due honour and veneration given to the images of the virgin mother of God, and the saints," in their churches, do Roman Catholics "violate the second of God's commandments?" Here is then a bold, unqualified assertion openly made of what has been distinctly contradicted by all our writers, that we adore the images of the Virgin Mary and other saints. Upon what ground does he make it? His first assertion was correct, that we believe "that images of Christ, of the mother of God, ever virgin, and of other saints, were to receive due honour and veneration." He stated, and truly, that this was founded upon a decree of the Council of Trent; that decree laid down that they were not to be worshipped, because of a belief that there was any divinity in them, nor was any trust to be placed in them, as the Gentiles placed trust in their idols, but Christ was to be adored through the image: the honour shown the image was to be referred to Christ, the original, who was really, truly, and properly adored, because he is God: the honour shown to the images of the blessed Virgin and other saints was to be referred to their originals, the saints, who were venerated, not adored. Here, then, the Council gave us two classes and two acts: Christ to be adored, and the Virgin and other saints to be venerated. The first dishonesty was in making three classes, instead of those two. Father Paul omitted the word *other*, by which the Virgin and other saints were shown to belong to one class, and gives us only the words, "the images of Christ, of the Virgin, and of saints," so as to destroy the classification of the Council. The next dishonesty was also that of Father Paul, in omitting the two verbs used by the Council—adore, which referred to Christ, and the verb venerate, relating to the saints, and by substituting a generic verb, which embraces adore and venerate, viz., worship; and thus, by this trick, was the distinction of the Council de-

stroyed. Your correspondent is next guilty of misrepresenting the words of St. Thomas of Aquin, who states that, through the image of Christ, "adoration" or *latria* might be paid to Christ himself, who is God; and distinguished his image from that of the saints, to whom no adoration was due, nor was any due to their images. It would be too glaring a forgery to insert "the words" which his work did not contain; but the adding of an *and so forth*, under the special circumstances of the case, answered the same purpose, and was unwarrantably recurred to. The effect of this trick was to go a step farther than Father Paul did, who merely exhibited the Council teaching that all those images were to be worshipped; but your correspondent, undertaking to show the meaning of the verb worship, exhibits St. Thomas teaching that they are to be adored with Latria, or the adoration due to God alone. The next piece of dishonesty consists in omitting the word Christ in the conclusion, which was the only word with which adoration was conjoined in the premises, and keeping adoration, and making it now agree with pictures, which were not in any part of the premises, and images of the saints, with which it was not connected by any true assertion in the premises, but to which it was unfairly connected by the studied equivocation of substituting the generic verb worship by Father Paul, and the dishonest attempt of showing from St. Thomas, that worship meant "adoration," *latria.* This process reminds me of a French distich, which I recollect somewhat imperfectly; and a better Eastern scholar, perhaps, can supply the old Arabic word, which has totally escaped my memory, but for which I give a substitute, *almacra,* which is not very unlike the true one.—The poet is criticising a Spanish writer, who derived the Spanish word *caballo,* "a horse," from the Arabic one for the same animal.

"*Caballo* vient d'*Almacra,* sans doute,
Mais il y a ete bien change dans sa route."
"*Caballo* is derived from *Almarca,* without doubt,
But it has been strangely metamorphosed on its route."

As Sancho would say, "the mother that bore it, would not know it." Indeed, gentlemen, we can scarcely ever recognise our own doctrines in your dresses. Your writers might be very good poets, but with both our hands we vote against their claim to be admitted as historians.

I shall now try your curious correspondent by a few of his own assertions, versus a few of his own assertions; and leave to you and himself to determine which is the true Sosio.

"Now the honour and veneration of the images of Christ, and so forth, thus provided for by the highest authority of the Roman Catholic Church, as indispensably obligatory, we know to be held and taught in that church to be not such as is due to God."—(Par. 23, p. 74, March.)

"They are required to give them (the images or pictures of the Virgin Mary, and other saints) in their churches, 'due honor and veneration;' and the religious honour due to them is considered by some of their own writers to be Latria '*honor sive cultus soli Deo exhibendus,*' the worship or honour to be given to God alone."—(Par. 24, p. 75, March.)

"The second was treated as a continuation of its subject prohibiting the worship of image gods; and as images were not worshipped as gods by the church."—(Par. 25, p. 76, March.)

"*Venite adoremus* is the express language of the *Roman Missal*: Come, let us adore. *Thou shalt not adore nor serve them,* is the language of their translation of Scripture. Roman Catholics will say they are not served; will they say that they are not adored? The language of the passage, as quoted by themselves, adore *nor* serve, not adore *and* serve."—(Note to par. 25, p. 76.)

Now, good gentlemen, if our writers, to the knowledge of this man, required for those images the honour to be given to God alone, how could he know that our Church held and taught that it was not honour such as is due God?

To this I may add another paragraph.

"The second Council of Nice, A. D. 786, which is referred to by the Council of Trent on this subject, did assert the direct worship of images; declaring, at the same time, that it should not be *Latria,* which is due only to God, but merely an honorary adoration."—(Par. 23, p. 74, March.)

In my last letter I enumerated twelve propositions upon which he and I appeared to be fully agreed, and I showed in his essay the grounds for my assertion that he taught those propositions. Allow me, therefore, to use them as his assertions, and to continue the contrast.

"First. That Roman Catholics pay to the one only God of the Scriptures a purer worship than they pay to any other being."

"Second. That the worship which they pay to this God is a kind which is given exclusively to him, and which we call adoration, to distinguish it from any other."

"Christians under the denomination of Roman Catholics, like other Christians, worship the one true God of the Scriptures. But their Church has authorized a use of images in their places of worship, that would make a certain kind of worship paid to them consistent with the purer and exclusive homage which Jehovah demands for himself."—(Par. 23, p. 73, March.)

"Do Catholics, then, thus dishonour Christ, the only mediator, and by giving to creatures the worship due to God alone, make themselves guilty of direct idolatry? To Protestants it cannot but appear that they do."—(Par. 9, p. 49, February.)

"That they who use such worship as that of which I have adduced the several specimens selected, give to the creatures the worship due to

God alone, will not, at first view, admit of question; nor is it easy, even on a closer consideration of the matter, to separate the reproach of direct idolatry from prayer addressed in the same litany to God and to the many canonized saints, arbitrarily determined to be capable of hearing and answering prayer, and as arbitrarily pronounced to be the blessed attendants of the Divine presence."—(Par. 9, p. 50, February.)

I shall at present adduce but one or two other passages. I first give two propositions from my last letter, as containing his assertions.

"Fourth. That there are different and distinct degrees of religious worship.

"Fifth. That however erroneous Roman Catholics might be, in their appendages of the worship of one only God, of which the worship of images is one, there is a wide distinction to be taken between them and those who worship fictitious deities, in idols in which they may be supposed to reside."

"His *dulia* might be an inferior worship: but if it was worship at all it was idolatry."—(Par. 23, p. 75, March.)

"And the religious honour due to them is considered by some of their own writers to be *Latria*, the worship or honour to be given to God alone; by others *dulia*, or the honour, or worship, or service which is paid to man by reason of some dignity, holiness, virtue or goodness."—(Par. 24, p. 75, March.)

This is rather a bold stroke, where we are told that there are degrees of worship superior and inferior; and that to give any worship at all is idolatry, whether it be the worship due to God, or paid to man. The exhibition which I give here is not by way of refutation. It is merely to ask your correspondent to reconcile his own assertions, as consistency is creditable. When he has disposed of these I have a few more at his service. I merely threw them in now, to fill my sheet, as I wish to leave untouched the next subjects, in treating of which, I must show how very widely different are his notions of mythology and of theology from those of, gentlemen,

Your obedient, humble servant,

B. C.

LETTER VIII.

Iris! descend and what we here ordain
Report to yon mad tyrant of the main.
Bid him from fight to his own deeps repair,
Or breathe from slaughter in the fields of air.
If he refuse, then let him timely weigh
Our elder birthright, and superior sway.
"What means the haughty sovereign of the skies?"
The King of Ocean thus, incensed, replies;
"Rule as he will his portioned realms on high,
No vassal god, nor of his train, am I.
Three brother deities from Saturn came,
And ancient Rhea, Earth's immortal dame:
Assign'd by lot, our triple rule we know;
Infernal Pluto sways the shades below;
O'er the wide clouds, and o'er the starry plain,
Ethereal Jove extends his high domain;
My court beneath the hoary waves I keep,
And hush the roarings of the sacred deep:
Olympus and this earth in common lie;
What claim has here the tyrant of the sky?"

POPE'S *Iliad*, Book xv.

CHARLESTON, S. C., June 20, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—Since much of what follows in the essay of your correspondent, must be explained by a reference to the precepts regarding idolatry, which were given by the Almighty to the Israelites, and of course to the nature of that worship itself, probably it will save much time and trouble, and tend to give us more clear notions upon the subjects of which we treat, should we at once investigate the nature of pagan idolatry.

Your correspondent informs us, paragraph 27, That he has abundant evidence that the Council of Trent misrepresented the heathens: and refers to the *Iliad*, the *Aeneid* and the *Pantheon*, in support of his assertion, which is contrary to that of the council. Probably we may yet discover better authority than either of those works. I shall in the first place give the statement of St. Thomas of Aquin, respecting the nature of pagan idolatry, and any person who doubts the accuracy of my translation, can, by applying at the *Miscellany* Office, consult the original.

"It is to be said, as was before stated, that an undue excess in the mode of divine worship is to be classed under the head of superstition. But this is principally done when divine worship is bestowed on that to which it ought not to be given: but, as we previously observed when we treated of religion, this divine worship

ought to be given only to the supreme, uncreated God. And therefore, it is superstitious to bestow it upon any creature whatever. But since worship is paid to God by some sensible signs, for instance by sacrifices, exhibitions, and others of this sort: so also it is used to be given to a creature represented by some sensible form or figure, which is called an idol. Yet this divine worship was given in various ways to idols.

"Some persons indeed, by a certain wicked art, constructed a sort of images, which by the power of devils had certain effects: whence people thought that in the images themselves there was some divinity; and consequently that divine worship was due to them. And this was the opinion of Hermes Trismegistus, as Augustine says in his book viii, *Of the City of God.*

"Others did not pay the worship of the Divinity to the images themselves, but to the creatures whose images they were. And the Apostle touches each of those. (*Rom.* i.) "And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of fourfooted beasts, and of creeping things." And as regards the second, he adds, "and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator." The opinions of those were of three sorts. Some indeed thought that certain men whom they worshipped through their images, were gods; such as Jupiter, Mercury, and such others. But some persons thought that the whole world was one God, not by reason of its bodily substance, but, by reason of a soul which they thought was God; saying that God was nothing else but a soul governing the world by motion and reason: as man is said to be wise by reason of his soul, not by reason of his body. Whence, they thought the worship of the divinity should be paid to the whole world, and to all its parts; to the heavens, to the air, to the waters and to all other portions of this description. And to these, as Varro said, they used to refer the names and the images of their gods; and as Augustine relates in his seventh book, *On the City of God.*

"But others, to wit, the Platonists, laid down that there was one supreme God as the cause of all things: after whom they placed, that there were certain spiritual substances created by the supreme God, which they called gods, by reason of their participation of the divinity, but we call them angels. After whom, they placed the souls of the heavenly bodies, and under those demons, who were, they said, certain airy animals, and under those they placed the souls of men, which through the merit of virtue, they believed to be assumed to the fellowship of gods or of demons; and they paid the worship of the divinity to all those, as Augustine relates in his book viii, *Of the City of God.*

"But they said that these two last opinions belonged to physical theology, which the philosophers considered in the world, and taught in the schools. But they said that the other, regarding the worship of men, belonged to fabulous theology, which according to the feigning of the poets was represented in the theatres. But the other opinion concerning images, they said belonged to civil theology, which was celebrated by the pontiffs in the temples. But all these belonged to the superstition of idolatry, whence Augustine says, in his second book, 'Of the doctrine of Christ,' All this is superstitious, whatsoever has been instituted by men to make and worship idols, leading to worship, or worshipping as God, any creature, or the part of any creature."—2da 2dæ, quæst. xciv. art. 1.

The authority to which the angelic doctor of the school refers in the above extract, is principally that of St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo,

who flourished in the decline of the fourth and the commencement of the fifth ages. He lived at a time, and amongst associates that still afforded him opportunities of learning from personal observation, facts which are to us now only the subject of remote history: his father was a pagan, and so were several of his companions and friends: and previously to his becoming a Christian, Augustine himself occupied an eminent place as an erudite and respectable scholar and rhetorician. He informs us himself that his work *Of the City of God* was compiled as a reply to the pagans who endeavoured to attribute to Christianity the destruction of Rome by Alaric. This work occupied some years of his life: and in it he enters deeply into the errors of paganism, for the purpose of exhibiting not only its contrast to Christianity, but its folly and criminality. It was published in the midst of pagans, and when several eminent scholars warmly advocated the mythological practices and the ancient philosophy. I therefore rely on its statements as deserving the highest credit. It is too late now, after the lapse of several centuries, for the republic of letters to be insulted by setting up the Iliad and the Aeneid, and the Pantheon as equivalent to the testimony of such a writer. They indeed give us the fabulous theologly or mythology of the poets; but this is only one, and the least useful subdivision of the information required to enable any person correctly to judge of the true nature of the religion of the people themselves. You might just as well refer to Tasso's *Jerusalem*, Milton's *Paradise*, and the *Lusiad* of Camoens, to know the exact nature of the Christian doctrine. O! it is sickening to behold the intoxicated conceit of those who have been forced in childhood to sip the shallow draughts, boastingly brought by meagre empirics, from the stream of knowledge! What a contrast is exhibited in the calm, dignified, and consistent demeanour of the sages, whose lives have been spent under the shadow of those venerable oaks that surround the fountain. One views in astonishment the collection of splendid and accurate charts that have been flung aside in the spirit of overweening pride, by the hardy and courageous adventures, who infected with the mania of indiscriminate reform, launch out as strangers, upon an ocean which has been navigated for ages. And what name shall we bestow upon those supercilious looks with which they regard the persons who use information of facts collected by their predecessors?

St. Augustine shows in this work, that the pagans were all polytheists, if not in belief, certainly in practice: he shows that even the followers of Plato paid divine honours to created spirits, whom they called gods, and clearly shows that Cicero was a polytheist, though he condemned the extravagance and absurdity of the civil as well as the

mythological ritual. Besides this, he shows that when the pagans worshipped their gods through images, they paid divine honour to created beings, and though the adoration should not have been directed to the image itself, yet being directed to a creature; and generally that creature was a devil, or some wicked mortal, the act was highly criminal. There is another class of pagans also exhibited, which paid the divine honours to the image itself, by reason of some divinity which they believed to be residing therein as in a body after its consecration, and this divinity was either an imaginary being, a devil, or a deceased human being, which they believed to be invoked to occupy, or evoked to desert the image. Towards the close of his eighth book, he, in chapter xxvii., finely vindicates the Christian honour of the martyrs and of their remains, contrasting the veneration which is shown to them with the divine honours which pagans paid to their imaginary deities.

In order then to come to distinct and satisfactory notions of the true nature of idolatry, I had better hastily view the origin of this crime. It is clear that in the days of Noe, the family, of which he was the head, and from which the human race is derived, had an accurate knowledge of God, and of the worship which should be paid to him. It is also clear that at the period of the erection of the tower of Babel, about one hundred and twenty years later, men had but one language, but at this period, they became divided in their tongues, and formed separate nations. The most ancient records point out to us Chaldea and Egypt, as subsequently the two principal nursing-places of the human race; and the earliest exhibitions of religion, different from that derived through Noe, are manifested in those two countries. There is a large body of evidence to show that the first error which was generally admitted after the corruption of the original traditions, consisted in a belief that there existed a universal soul which animated the world. It was manifested, they thought, in the activity of fire, the fertilizing or the overwhelming power of water, the productiveness of the earth; the menace of thunder and the fury of the wind. Man forgot the Lord of nature even in the contemplation of his works. Local circumstances gave direction to the mind of the worshipper, and whilst the Chaldean adored the soul of the universe in the stars which he observed, the Egyptian saw its influence in the waters of the Nile, and in their connexions, whilst the Persian viewed the glories of the sun, and paid his homage to the element of fire. The natural alliance between the appearance of the heavenly bodies and those changes of the weather, an acquaintance with which was so necessary to an unsheltered and agricultural people, as well as the regularity of the phases and motions which those stars exhibited, added to

the brilliancy of their aspect, made "the army of heaven," as they were soon called, an object of the earliest wonder and veneration for a people who found, as they believed, their most important concerns influenced by this heavenly host, of which the sun was king, and the moon was queen. It was but a step, and that easy and natural, to view each prominent light as an individual, guided by its own genius, and that genius the portion of the universal soul which animated and watched over this luminary alone. Thus the Creator was forgotten, and the created objects received the homage which was due only to him. The entire was a gross error, which is finely described in the following passage of the *Book of Wisdom*, which, you, gentlemen, have thought proper to reject from amongst the inspired writings, but which you still admit to be read for instruction of life and manners, and which you of course believe to be at least the testimony of a respectable and well-informed witness, regarding an important and public fact, the existence of which he was then more competent, than we now can be to ascertain.

"1. But all men are vain, in whom there is not the knowledge of God; and who by these good things that are seen, could not understand him, that is, neither by attending to the works have acknowledged who was the workman:

"2. But having imagined either the fire, or the wind, or the swift air, or the circle of the stars, or the great water, or the sun and moon, to be the gods that rule the world:

"3. With whose beauty if they, being delighted, took them to be gods, let them know how much the Lord of them is more beautiful than they: for the first author of beauty made all those things.

"4. Or if they admired their power and their effects, let them understand by them, that he that made them is mightier than they:

"5. For by the greatness of the beauty, and of the creature, the Creator of them may be seen, so as to be known thereby.

"6. But yet as to these they are less to be blamed. For they perhaps err, seeking God, and desirious to find him.

"7. For being conversant among his works, they search: and they are persuaded that the things are good which are seen.

"8. But then again they are not to be pardoned.

"9. For if they were able to know so much, as to make a judgment of the world: how did they not more easily find out the Lord thereof." (*Wisdom*, chap. xiii.)

Here now was a crime, 1st, because of not giving adoration to the true God; 2d, because of multiplying gods; and 3d, because of giving to a creature the homage which was due only to the Creator. This crimi-

nality existed before an image was made; Job mentions this as criminal conduct, in chapter xxxi., as regarded the sun and moon. In process of time the arts of painting and sculpture arose, and were improved: images were then made; the adorers of the several portions of creation expressed in emblematic devices representations of the object of their worship, Baal, Ashtaroth, Anubis, Isis, and so forth. These representations had no real prototypes, nor were the invented figures similitudes or copies of any of the objects in which the genii were supposed to dwell: but the persons who had the figure made, imagined forth those limbs and features which they thought best fitted to express the qualities of the god whom they adored.

Ειδολον or "*idolum*" is a likeness, and so is εικος "*imago*;" but there was an obvious distinction between an emblematic statue for which there was no real prototype, or original from which it could be copied, or to whose likeness it was made; and that statue which was the copy of an original in nature. Hence the words soon came in common usage to be differently appropriated, *idolum* to the representation of a fictitious God, and *imago* to the representation of that which had a natural prototype. The worshipper of the fictitious deities was criminal in those times before an image was made, and now when he paid divine honour to his imaginary god, through the idol, his crime was not thereby diminished, but if in his folly he imagined the genius of the sun, for instance, after invocation to reside in the statue of Baal, and then paid his homage to that deity as actually residing in the idol, he was at least more besotted, if not more criminal. The worship due to the deity was generally designated *latria*, and hence the worshipper of idols was called an *idolater*. In this view then, idolatry deprived the Creator of his homage, and transferred it to an imaginary being or to an idol. The author of the *Book of Wisdom* continues in the subsequent part of his chap. xiii., and in the commencement of his chap. xiv. down to verse 14, to describe this mode of making and of worshipping of idols.

To this was now added a new species of error, which is described in the subsequent verses. The servants of a great man began to pay divine honours to the image of his son: and the next process was paying divine honours to other statues by the wicked custom of law, and by the order of tyrants. The history of the Egyptian, the Grecian, and the Roman people will exhibit the same series of facts: as well as those described in the 22d and subsequent verses of chapter xiv., regarding the unnatural and other criminal rites which accompanied this idolatry. Thus, to take a sketch of the basis of mythology, we find that the heavens and the earth were the parents of Chronos, or Time, or Saturn the father

of Jupiter the king of the gods: and when we follow up the explanations of the philosophers, we are brought back exactly to the point from which I set out. The matter of the heavens and of the earth was eternal. Time produced all other things, even the genii who preside over the various parts of the heavens, of the earth, of the air, of the waters, and of the regions below. The genii of the East became the gods of the Greek and of the Roman; their names were changed according to the variety of language; and the worship due to God alone, was given to creatures through the idols, and frequently to the idols themselves: heroes and demi-gods were next assumed into the rank of the celestial and infernal gods, and the rites of divine worship were paid alike to all. The Creator was overlooked, and idols were adored. Gentlemen, if your curious correspondent should take it into his head, from his knowledge of the *Iliad*, the *Aeneid*, and the *Pantheon*, to call any part of this statement into question, I beg to inform you that it is not thoughtlessly hazarded; there is abundant evidence to sustain its averments, but I do not deem it now necessary to exhibit an array of testimony, which is at his service.

In this view of pagan idolatry are included, first, the ommission of worshipping the true God; secondly, polytheism; thirdly, paying divine honour to created beings, or to imaginary beings; fourthly, the ceremonial of worship was, in its own nature, and in its necessary consequences, generally of the most demoralizing tendency. The created beings were animate, or inanimate; but when this worship was paid to an inanimate idol, it was generally because of a notion that a divinity resided therein: and that this was apparently the case, and not always gratuitously or absurdly imagined by the vulgar, the various oracular answers given from shrines and idols, especially at Delphos, bear ample testimony. I acknowledge they were impositions, whether merely human, or diabolical, this is not the place to discuss; but they were such as to cause kings and senators and nations to apply for information to the shrine or idol, under the most solemn circumstances, and after the most mature deliberation. We can now form a distinct notion of pagan idolatry.

The *Theogony* of Hesiod, as well as the other ancient pieces of the Greeks, will confirm this view. I will not assert that there might not have existed some exceptions to the general statement; I shall not say that every man in Greece was ignorant of the nature of the Lord of the Universe; but I do state, that no evidence of their knowledge has reached our day. Socrates, if he know the nature of God, certainly was deficient in one great point of duty, for he had sacrifice, which is the greatest act of divine worship, paid to the god Esculapius. His disciple, Plato,

not only profited by the knowledge of Socrates, but is supposed to have received some communications of the true and enlightening doctrine of the Jews; and his supposed pure Theism, like the Great Spirit of our aborigines, is the idol of modern infidelity. St. Augustine had no extraordinary respect for this best production of the philosophical research of antiquity. Let us observe a mere outline of Plato's system. In his *Timaeus* he lays down as a principle, that the soul or spirit should exist before the body which it is to animate or to govern; from this principle, also, in the 10th *Book of Laws*, he concludes that God must have existed before matter was arranged, for by his intelligence it was made harmonious in its movements. He exhibits to us the whole matter of the universe as animated and moved by a universal soul, without informing us whether this Psyche is God, or a spirit which has been created: we are informed that this universal soul has been distributed amongst the heavenly bodies and the earth; those bodies are then called "divine animals," "celestial gods," and so forth. Those celestial gods have produced beings who generally invisible, yet have power of manifesting themselves; they are genii, demons, and other spirits, and those lower spirits are the beings commissioned to form man and terrestrial animals, to animate them with portions of soul derived from the stars, and so forth. He states, that we can neither conceive nor explain the origin of the celestial gods, but that we ought to respect the accounts which we have received from our ancestors, of those beings who, they said, were their parents. Plato believed that matter was eternal; God was not its Creator, but its modeller. Yet, according to his own principle, the soul which animated matter must have previously existed, that is, existed before that which was eternal! Were I to enter into any examination, it would occupy space and time which this present object does not require. This eminent philosopher did not exhibit to us, as the object of our adoration, "the Lord of Hosts," "the Creator of the Universe," but the "celestial gods," or "the genii." But when Christianity was established, and the early Christian writers assailed this idolatry, then, for the first time, the able and ingenious pagans of the Platonic school endeavoured to take shelter under the shield of Christianity itself, by adopting the doctrine of minor and relative veneration, which was ultimately referable to "God the eternal," "the supreme God," and so forth. Celsus was one of the first who had recourse to this strategem; Origen gives us his statement; Julian the Apostate went farther, and, as St. Cyril informs us, had the hardihood to say that the pagans adored as their "supreme God," "the Jehovah of the Jews:" and Celsus and Julian are not without imitators. But they were the first who made the

assertions, and those assertions were then new and inadmissible. And since truth must continue unchanged through all times, those assertions, though somewhat older at present, are now equally inadmissible.

I feel it to be altogether out of the question, that I should introduce full proofs of my various positions; but yet it is proper that I should, at least, allude to a few of the testimonies which are so abundant, and at hand. Origen, in his Homily 8, on Exodus, in expounding the meaning of the phrase "graven thing," or "graven image," which the Septuagint, long before Christianity, translated in *Exodus* xx. by the word ειδολον, gives the distinction which I previously laid down between image and idol: the first being copied from a prototype; the second being the representation of that which does not exist, and is, therefore, "a falsehood," "a lie," "a lying thing," "a deceit," and so forth, as it is frequently called by sacred writers. Theodoret gives the same distinction in Quæs. 38, upon the same passage. Tertullian states that ειδολον is a diminutive of ειδος, "*forma*," or appearance, to show, by the use of the diminutive, there was no expression of the prototype; for those diminutives were used either to denote extraordinary affection, or such imperfection as created contempt, (*lib. de idolatria.*) Hence, Lucian also calls the shades of the dead ειδολα, phantasmatic delusions, unreal mockeries: thus St. Augustine informs us, in *Psalm* cxxxv., that, what the Greeks called ειδολα, the Latins called *simulacra*, which word is derived, not from *similis*, "like," but from *simulare*, "to pretend;" whence St. Jerome, in cap. vii. *Oseae*, states that *simulacrum* is opposed to God, as falsehood is to truth, because it represents "a false god." I omit several others that lie before me, and proceed to exhibit the same distinction from the Scriptures.

St. Paul, in Col. i. 15, styles the incarnate Son "the image of the invisible God," not ειδολον, but εικον του θεου του αορατου; and in *Hebrew* i. 3, "the express image of his person," not ειδολον, but *character*; no one would translate this by *idolum*, but every scholar would give *imago*. In *Exodus* xx. 4, the translators who made the Septuagint gives us ειδολον "*idolum*," an idol; and then ομοιομα, which is by some rendered "*similitudo*," likeness, by others "*simulacrum*," the meaning of which we have seen above: in *Leviticus* xix. 4, repeating the precept, Moses tells the Israelites not to follow ειδολοις, idols, and immediately adjoins "nor gods made by fusion," or "molten gods." In *Numbers* xxiii. 21, your version gives us, not the translation of the Hebrew, according to St. Jerome, nor that of the Septuagint, but that of the Samaritan, with which the Syriac and Arabic nearly correspond, but to which the Chaldaic paraphrase would appear to be opposed. If

there be no distinction between idols and images, I believe it would be very hard to reconcile those various readings; but if we only admit this distinction, the reconciliation is at once effected. St. Jerome tells us that the meaning of the Hebrew is such as we translate it.

"There is no idol in Jacob; neither is there an image-god to be seen in Israel."

You translate it.

"He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob: neither hath he seen perverseness in Israel."

Both translations agree in the next phrase.

"The Lord his God is with him," and so forth.

Now, according to our translation, this was a declaration that Israel could not be cursed by Balaam, because, not only there was not an idol to be found in their camp, nor an image-god: but the Lord God of Israel was to be found therein. The Chaldaic paraphrase strengthens this, for it makes Balaam say, "I see that there are no servers of idols, nor any workers of falsehood in Israel." Yet in fact at this very time, there were in the camp, the images of the Cherubim, over the ark, or mercy seat; but they were not idols, because they were not made to be adored or served with divine homage; neither were they "image-gods," although they were images: and the Lord God, whom Balaam declared to be present, dwelt between those very images (*Exod.* xxv. 22; xl. 34, 38); and they had prototypes, after the pattern of which they were made, (*Exod.* xxv. 9, 40; xxvi. 30, and so forth,). From the view already taken, as well as from an inspection of *Exodus* xxv. 18, and so forth, as also of *I* or *III Kings* vi. 23 to 36, it will be perceived that an image could lawfully be made, and not only without iniquity, but even in obedience to divine command, and therefore religiously; but an idol could never be made without iniquity: and the word which signified an idol, thus became synonymous with the iniquity of idolatry: the word which signified an "image-god" also signified perverseness, so that I do not object to your translation as wanting in literal correctness, provided the words be, as they ought to be, understood to mean, this special iniquity and this particular perverseness,—as he who made an "image-god," is very properly said by the Chaldaic paraphrase to be "a worker of falsehood." Thus the Samaritan has the words "iniquity," and "prevarication," the Arabic "fraud," for idol, and "deceit," for image-god, and in this it agrees fully with the Syriac. If then we view "iniquity" to mean idol, and "perverseness" image-god, the translations at once are reconciled: and though there were images in the camp, yet there were not idols or image-gods therein. My object in making those references, which might be easily multiplied, was to show that an idol or image-

god was always designated in the old Scriptures, not merely by the phrase which would signify an image, such as that of the cherub; but by a word or phrase that signified an empty or vain, or deceitful representation; or "iniquity," as idolatry is called in *Osee* vi. 8, "work of iniquity," and hence in the New Testament, St. Paul (*I. Cor.* viii. 4) writes, "we know that an idol ειδολον, is nothing in the world," that is, "an idol is a vain, lying representation of what has not existence in the world." And again, the Apostle proceeds, "and that there is none other God but one. 5. For though there be these that are called gods, whether in heaven, or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many.) 6. But to us there is but one God," and so forth. That is "idols lead to polytheism, or the worship of many gods, but we have only one God." I shall close this discussion by a reference to the meaning of the words generally used in the old Scripture, for those objects of pagan worship, and of Jewish prevarication. *Bahalim*, "masters or lords," *Elilim*, "imaginary beings," *Schedim*, or *Schoudim*, "wicked or destructive beings, or iniquitous," *Tsijjim*, or *Scharhirim*, "monsters, or ugly animals, or wild ferocious beasts." Again in our version, *Psalm* xcv. 5, we read,

"For all the gods of the Gentiles are devils: but the Lord made the heavens."

The contrast is here drawn between the beings who were actually worshipped if you will, "through the images," and the Creator, who was neglected by the Gentiles, or I shall take your own version of the same passage, *Psalm* xcvi. 5:

"For all the gods of the nations are idols: but the Lord made the heavens."

Your version confines the Pagan worship to the idols themselves; ours shows that it was carried through the idols or images, to devils; but it is plain, that take it which way you will, the Gentiles did not adore the Creator but the creatures, whether the devils or the images, matters little; it was idolatry. Our doctrine and practice then are, that divine honour is to be paid only to the one God, the Creator and supreme Lord of the heavens and the earth, to the "Lord of the heavenly host" and not to the "host of heaven."

Under ordinary circumstances, what I have written would be more than enough, but as there appears to be a disposition to force us into the ranks of idolaters, whether we will or not; and, as many very strange assertions are made respecting the belief and practice of the ancients, probably it would be as well to resume the subject in my next.

I am, gentlemen,

Your obedient, humble servant, B. C.

LETTER IX.

Forthwith from every squadron and each band
The heads and leaders thither haste where stood
Their great commander; godlike shapes and forms
Excelling human, princely dignities;
And powers that erst in heaven, sat on thrones,
Though of their names in heavenly records now
Be no memorial; blotted out and ras'd
By their rebellion from the books of life.
Nor had they yet among the sons of Eve
Got them new names; till, wandering o'er the earth,
Through God's high sufferance for the trial of man
By falsities and lies the greatest part
Of mankind they corrupted to forsake
God their Creator, and the invisible
Glory of him that made them to transform
Oft to the image of a brute, adorn'd
With gay religions, full of pomp and gold,
And devils to adore for deities:
Then were they known to men by various names,
And various idols through the heathen world.

MILTON'S *Paradise Lost*, Book I.

CHARLESTON, S. C., June 27, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—In my last, I have exhibited an outline of the idolatrous worship of the pagans; in it, you have seen stated, that they paid no worship to the Creator of the world, the eternal and invisible God, but that they worshipped imaginary beings, under strange figures fashioned according to fancy; or they worshipped creatures, whether they believed them to reside in images or not; those creatures were in many instances devils, who sought to arrogate to themselves the homage due to the Creator, and in opposition to him. Upon the principle which I have taken as my guide, it is proper that I should satisfy my readers, that those assertions have not been gratuitously made, though I shall not enter into full evidence for their support. If I can prove that it was not "the eternal God," "the Creator" whom they adored as "their supreme God," I shall have established my first position. Your correspondent very wisely keeps clear of committing himself upon this point. Nay, he even appears to me to be fully aware of the correctness of my assertion, and to coincide with me therein, for in his essay 2, paragraph 23, he admits a wide distinction in favour of "Christian worshippers of the one only God," and "those who with no knowledge or belief of the one Jehovah" worshipped "fictitious deities," and also between them

and the Indian who "through his idols" "worshipped the unknown God." Now they who neither knew nor believed anything of the one Jehovah could not worship him through an image, or without one.

The supreme god worshipped by the idolatrous Greeks and Romans was Jupiter, or Jove, who certainly was not the eternal God, because he was the son of Saturn, who was himself the son of Cœlus, and so forth, neither was he the "Creator," because Cœlus and Terra, or the Heavens and the Earth, which were his grandfather and grandmother, pre-existed to his father: what then are we to think of the information of those good writers, who gravely tell us that the mythology of Greece and Rome placed Jupiter, the supreme god, in the situation of our Jehovah, or "God the Creator," and Neptune, Pluto, and so forth, in the situation of our saints? Verily, the good simple men need to be taught. But if they have been taught, and if they do know those facts, and if they have during some years, laboured in teaching those same facts to children, what are we to think of the religious integrity of those holy asserters? Yea,—of a truth then, is their religious integrity a noble phenomenon!!

But, gentlemen, your curious correspondent might easily have referred to a better author than either of those mentioned by him, if his object was to make us well acquainted with the heathen mythology. Ovid wrote expressly upon the subject.

> *"Ante mare et tellus, et quod tegit omnia, caelum,*
> *Unus erat toto Naturae vultus in orbe.*
> *Quem dixere Chaos."*
> "Before the seas, and this terrestrial ball
> And heaven, high canopy, that covers all,
> One was the face of Nature; if a face:
> Rather a rude and indigested mass:
> A lifeless lump, unfashion'd unframed,
> Of jarring seeds; and justly Chaos named."

Thus Ovid gives us matter, or chaos in the first instance, before all things; he then proceeds to inform us of its subsequent distribution or arrangement.

> *"Sic ubi dispositam, quisquis fuit ille Deorum,*
> *Congeriem secuit, sectamque in membra redegit."*
> "Thus when the God, whatever God was he,
> Had formed the whole, and made the parts agree."

We have thus found his testimony in the first book of his *Metamorphoses*, for the pre-existence of chaos, or matter inereated; and some one of the gods,—one whom they did not know, subsequently regulating the parts, of which this chaos was composed.

"*Postquam, Saturno tenebrosa in Tartara misso, Sub Jove mundus erat.*"
"But when good Saturn, banish'd from above,
Was driven to Hell, the world was under Jove."

We are now brought to the exhibition of who was "the supreme god" of the Greeks and Romans. This Jove or Jupiter, clearly then was neither the god who created chaos, nor he who regulated its parts. A slight reference to the *Theogony* of Hesiod will perhaps not be here amiss.

"Hail, maids celestial, seed of Heaven's great king,
Hear, nor unaided let thy poet sing,
Inspire a lovely lay, harmonious nine,
My theme th' immortal gods, a race divine,
Of Earth, of Heaven which lamps of light adorn,
And of old sable Night, great parents, born," and so forth.

I make but such few extracts as are necessary for my purpose, but am careful not to garble, so as to misrepresent any idea of the original, or to suggest any not contained therein. I shall quote from Cooke's translation and refer to the lines.

"Chaos, of all the origin, gave birth;
First to her offspring the wide-bosomed Earth,
The seat secure of all the gods, who now
Possess Olympus ever clothed with snow:
Th' abodes of Hell from the same fountain rise, and so forth. (Line 190.)
. . . . . .
And Erebus, black son, from Chaos came, 202.
Born with his sister Night, a sable dame.
Night born, the produce of her am'rous play
With Erebus, the sky, and cheerful day.
Earth, first an equal to herself in fame
Brought forth, that covers all, the starry frame,
The spacious Heaven, of gods the safe domain, and so forth.
. . . . . .
At length the Ocean, with his pools profound, 214.
Whose whirling streams pursue their rapid round,
Of Heaven and Earth is born.
To these successive wily Saturn came, 223.
As sire and son in each a barbarous name.
. . . . . .
Rhea to Saturn bore, her brother god, 694.
Vesta and Ceres; Juno, golden shod,
And Pluto, hard of heart, whose wide command
Is o'er a dark and subterraneous land,
A pow'rful monarch, hence derive their birth
With Neptune, deity who shakes the earth:
Of these great Jove, the ruler of the skies
Of gods and men the sire, in council wise,

Is born; and him the universe adores,
And the earth trembles when his thunder roars.
Saturn from Earth and Heav'n adorned with stars,
Had learned the rumor of approaching wars,
Great as he was, a greater should arise
To rob him of his empire of the skies,
The mighty Jove his son,'' and so forth.

I may here safely conclude that the Pagans did not worship the true God in any manner whatsoever; not in spirit and in truth, not through the images of Jupiter, of Baal, of Beelzebub, or of any other, called the king of heaven, the supreme god, or by whatever other name he might be designated.

Whom then did they worship, through their idols? Let the few extracts which I adduce inform you, and you have only to call for others of a similar description if you need them. I here quote from your own version, unless I state otherwise.

''And the priest shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar of the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and burn the fat for a sweet savour unto the Lord. And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone a whoring,'' and so forth.—(*Levit.* xvii. 6, 7.)

Catholic version. (*Deut.* xxxii. 15, 16, 17, 18.) ''He forsook God who made him, and departed from God his Saviour. They provoked him by strange gods, and stirred him up to anger with their abominations. They sacrificed to devils and not to God, to gods whom they knew not; that were newly come up, whom their fathers worshipped not. Thou hast forgotten the God that begot thee, and hast forgotten the Lord that created thee. The Lord saw and was moved to wrath, because his own sons and daughters provoked him.

Protestant version. ''Then he forsook God that made him, and lightly esteemed the rock of his salvation. They provoked him to jealousy with strange gods, with abominations provoked they him to anger. They sacrificed unto devils; not to God; to gods whom they knew not; to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not. Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that formed thee. And when the Lord saw it he abhorred them, because of the provoking of his sons and of his daughters.''

Catholic version. (*Psalm cvi.* Catholic *Psalm* cv.) ''19. They made also a calf in Horeb: and they adored the graven thing, and they changed their glory into the likeness of a calf that eateth grass,'' and so forth.

Protestant version. ''19. They made a calf in Horeb, and worshipped the molten image. 20. Thus they changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth grass. 21. They forgot God their Saviour, which had done great things in Egypt.''

Catholic version. ''They were also initiated to Beelphegor,'' and so forth.

Protestant version. ''28. They joined themselves also unto Baalpeor and eat the sacrifices of the dead. 29. Thus they provoked him to anger with their inventions.''

Protestant version. (*Numbers* xxv.) ''1. And Israel abode in Shittim, and the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab. 2. And they

called the people unto the sacrifices of their gods: and the people did eat, and bowed down to their gods. 3. And Israel joined himself unto Baal-peor,'' and so forth.

The idols that they adored were dead and the sacrifices offered them were by way of contempt called the ''sacrifices of the dead,'' to show the vanity of idols, in contrast with ''the living God,'' who necessarily possesses life and communicates it. The Psalmist proceeds to show who were the objects of adoration through the images of those idolaters.

Protestant version. (*Psalm* cvi.) ''35. But they were mingled among the heathen, and learned their works. 36. And they served their idols; which were a snare unto them. 37. Yea, they sacrificed their sons and daughters unto devils. 38. And shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons, and of their daughters, whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan: and the land was polluted with blood. 39. Thus were they defiled with their own works, and went a whoring after their own inventions.''

I shall now make a very short reference to the *Pantheon*, as your correspondent seems to like the book.

Section 4. *Names of Jupiter.* ''In different places, and languages, he was afterwards called Beel, Baal, Beelphegor, Beelzebub, and Belzemen.''

Allow me, good gentlemen, to refer you now to a few texts of the Old and New Testaments, merely for a specimen of the evidence which is at your service.

''2. And Ahaziah fell down through a lattice that was in his upper chamber in Samaria, and was sick: and he sent messengers, and he said unto them, Go, and inquire of Baalzebub, the god of Ekron, whether I shall recover of this disease. 3. But the angel of the Lord said to Elijah the Tishbite, Arise, go up and meet the messengers of the king of Samaria, and say unto them, Is it not because there is not a god in Israel, that ye go to inquire of Baalzebub the god of Ekron?''—*Kings* II. or *IV.* chap. i.

''24. But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of devils.''—*Matthew* xii.

''25. But some of them said, He casteth out devils through Beelzebub the chief of the devils.''—*Luke* xi.

I should hope that we are no longer to be annoyed by the unlettered folly of those who assert, that in worshipping Jupiter, the heathens adored the eternal God, the Creator, where it is plain that they adored the prince of devils. Nor am I aware of the question having been ever seriously raised by any scholar as to the independent power of each deity, in the estimation of the pagans. To the reader of the *Iliad* the contentions of Juno and of other celestial and infernal divinities with Jupiter must be familiar. They are equally gods, as he is; he summons them to his council, and after the consultation, which is not always marked by kindness for each other, he takes the votes and ratifies the decision, often against his own private inclination.—Thus, they are not obsequious adorers, created by him, dependent upon him, and whom he

might annihilate, but they are turbulent and frequently vicious reprovers and opposers of his wishes. Towards the close of the first book of the *Iliad*, we find Jupiter granting a request of Thetis, to give victory to the Trojans; but warning her to depart quickly, lest his loving spouse Juno should see her, and give him all the benefit of her eloquence. And indeed, some very extraordinary greetings are exchanged between the loving pair, when the queen of gods makes the discovery, but her white-armd majesty is cheered by Vulcan with a vase of nectar. The third book opens with an exhibition of the council chamber of the deities. The fifth book shows us the gods mixed with the opposite armies in battle. Passing over the various other places which exhibit the polytheism of Homer, Virgil gives us a pretty good specimen towards the close of his third book. In every page of the Pantheon the same evidence is given. Even in the very passage which your correspondent quotes from Cicero, paragraph 27, Essay 2, that philosopher and orator writes of the gods in the plural. Yet strange as it may appear, the question is not only raised whether the heathens were polytheists, but, a certain grave sort of being, in this city, has asserted that they were not, in order that our fellow-citizens might be persuaded that we were idolaters!!! Is this what we are to style the refinement of our age and the progress of information? Indeed, indeed, those gentry often remind me of an order once given to a squad of recruits, "advance backward, three steps."

"4. They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone."—*Daniel*, chap. v.

"26. Moreover, ye see and hear, that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying, that they be no gods which are made with hands: 27. So that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at nought: but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised, and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshippeth."—*Acts* xix.

"5. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many and lords many.")—*I Corinthians* viii.

"8. Howbeit, then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods."—*Galatians* iv.

Besides those passages, we have several others in various parts of the Holy Scriptures, which distinctly mention the polytheism of idolaters. I shall advert to a very few of the early instances. In *Genesis* xxxi. 30, we read of the gods of Laban having been stolen. In chapter xxxv. 2, we find Jacob commanding the household to put away *strange gods*, as he was preparing by the divine command to erect an altar; and in v. 4, we find that Jacob buried the gods and their appendages. That the family of the patriarchs were with great difficulty preserved from

the polytheism of Mesopotamia and of Egypt, is evident from the necessity which Josue found, after so long an interval, to give the solemn injunction, (*Josue* xxiv. 14, and so forth).

"Now, therefore, fear the Lord, and serve him in sincerity and truth: and put away the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the flood, and in Egypt, and serve ye the Lord."

The choice he gives them, in the next verse, is between the gods at the other side of the flood, or the gods of the country of the Amorites, in which they were each given in the plural, gods, or to serve the true and only God, given in the singular, the Lord: in verse 20, he tells them that they must cease to serve the Lord, if they serve strange gods: and in 23, he tells them to put away strange gods. This also is shown fully in *Amos* v., to which St. Stephen alludes; and indeed the very words of which, this proto-martyr quotes in his speech, (*Acts* vii), where he states that God permitted their fathers "to worship the host of heaven," when they kept "the tabernacle of Moloch and the star of their god, Remphan, figures which they made to worship." I need not refer to the books of Judges, of Kings and the Prophets, which teem with evidence equally strong, as do the words of the pagans themselves; and yet some of our good, sleek, modern Christians, will say this was not polytheism!!! Jupiter was the supreme god, and the other gods were saints!!! Let them read the fifteenth book of the *Iliad.*

I now proceed to allude to a few facts out of many, that show the belief which the pagans had in the virtue of idols: and, though it might happen that Cicero, or a few others formed an exception, I shall easily show the general impression to have been, that there was in particular images, some virtue far beyond the mere value of their materials, or their memorial effect. In the sixth book of the *Iliad*, Helenus tells Hector to retire from the battle, and send his mother and the other principal matrons of Troy to the tower in which the Palladium was kept; this, you know, was an image of Minerva, which so protected the city as to prevent the fall thereof, so long as it was safely kept. Homer gives us the words which Pope thus translates, as Hector's direction to his mother.

"You, with your matrons, go! a spotless train,
And burn rich odours in Minerva's fane:
The largest mantle your full wardrobes hold,
Most prized for art, and laboured o'er with gold,
Before the goddess' honoured knees be spread,
And twelve young heifers to the altar led.
So may the power, atoned by fervent prayer,
Our wives, our infants, and our city spare, and so forth.
. . . . . .
Soon as to Ilion's topmost tower they come,

And awful reach the high Palladian dome,
Antenor's consort, fair Theano, waits
As Pallas' priestess, and unbars the gates,
With hands uplifted and imploring eyes,
They fill the dome with supplicating cries.
The priestess then the shining veil displays,
Placed on Minerva's knees, and thus she prays:
. . . . . .
So prayed the priestess in her holy fane;
So vowed the matrons, but they vowed in vain."

The subsequent history is well known. Two Greeks stole the image, and the city was then left an unprotected prey to its enemies. But, let us come to the *Aeneid*, on the same subject.

Interea at templum non aequae Palladis ibant
Crinibus Iliades passis, peplumque ferebant.
Suppliciter tristes, et tunsae pectora palmis,
Diva solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat.

1 *Aencid*, 483.

"Meantime, a pensive, supplicating train
Of Trojan matrons, to Minerva's fane,
In sad procession with a robe repair,
Beat their white breasts, and rend their golden hair.
Unmoved with prayers, disdainfully she frowned,
And fix'd her eyes, relentless, on the ground."

We have another instance in the next book of the *Aeneid*, where he is describing the desolation of the ruined city, and the carnage.

Aedibus in mediis, nudoque sub aetheris axe 512
Ingens ara fuit, juxtaque veterrima laurus,
Incumbens arae, atque umbra complexa Penates,
Hic Hecuba, et natae nequicquam altaria circum,
Praecipites atra ceu tempestate columbae,
Condensae, et Divum amplexae simulacra tenebant.
"Within the courts, beneath the naked sky,
An altar rose, an aged laurel by;
That o'er the hearth and household-gods displayed
A solemn gloom, a deep majestic shade:
Hither, like doves, who close embodied fly
From some dark tempest, black'ning in the sky,
The queen for refuge with her daughters ran,
Clung and embraced their images in vain."

In the beginning of this book, Sinon, in imposing upon the Trojans, must have spoken to them in a manner that was according to their mode of thinking; and he, line 171, and so forth, states:

Nec dubiis ea signa dedit Tritonia monstris.
Vix positum castris simulacrum; arsere coruscae
Luminibus flammae arrectis, salsusque per artus
Sudor iit, terque ipsa solo (mirabile dictu)

Emicuit, parmamq; ferens hastamq, trementem.

"And many a dreadful sign
To trembling Greece proclaim'd the wrath divine.
Scarce to the camp the sacred image came,
When from her eyes she flashed a living flame;
A briny sweat bedewed her limbs around,
And thrice she sprung indignant from the ground;
Thrice was she seen with martial rage to wield
Her pond'rous spear, and shake her blazing shield."

I shall pass over various other passages of Virgil, and I now come to an extract from *The Schoolboy's Pantheon*:

"The Palladium was an image of Pallas, preserved in the castle of the city of Troy; for, while the castle and temple of Minerva were building, they say, this image fell from heaven into it, before it was covered with a roof. This raised everybody's admiration; and, when the oracle of Apollo was consulted, he answered: 'That the city should be safe, so long as that image remained within it.' Therefore, when the Greeians besieged Troy, they found that it was impossible to take the city, unless the Palladium was taken out of it. This business was left to Ulysses and Diomedes, who undertook to ereep into the city through the common sewers, and bring away the fatal image. When they had performed the task, Troy was taken without difficulty. Some say it was not lawful for any person to remove the Palladium, or even to look upon it. Others add, that it was made of wood, so that it was a wonder how it could move the eyes and shake the spear. Others, on the contrary, report, that it was made of the bones of Pelops, and sold to the Trojans by the Scythians, They add, that Aeneas recovered it, after it had been taken by the Greeks from Diomedes, and carried it with him into Italy, where it was laid up in the temple of Vesta, as a pledge of the stability of the Roman empire, as it had been before a token of the security of Troy; and, lastly, others write, that there were two Palladia: one of which Diomedes took, and the other Aeneas carried with him."

The dedication of the statues, their consecration, and so forth, are so well known, as scarcely to need even reference. The evocation, or *exauguratio*, in opposition to *inauguratio*, is equally well known: by the latter the divinity was called into possession of the idol, or image, or temple: by the former he was called out, or evoked, and the object was thus desecrated. In chap. lv. of the first book of Livy, it is stated that when various other gods were turned out to make room for Jupiter at the building of the Capitol, the god Terminus would not quit. In the next chapter a delegation is sent by the king of Delphos, for the purpose of learning from the oracle of Apollo, what no Etruscan or Roman shrine, or image, or augur could resolve. In chapter xxii. of the fifth book, to complete the destruction of Veii, a religious ceremony is performed, by which Juno, their tutelar deity, is, through her statue, invited to Rome; and it being supposed that she gave her assent by some visible sign, the image was borne along, and Camillus dedicated her temple on the Aventine hill. The *lectisternium*, which Livy mentions

in chap. xiii. of the same book, consisted in bringing the images of Apollo, Latona, Diana, Hercules, Mercury, and Neptune to feast at a well-furnished table during eight days, to render them propitious; and such a ceremony was frequently used in after times. In chap. xiv. of the prophet Daniel, you only give us twelve chapters—we have the history of the quantity of provisions given every day to be consumed by the idol Bel, and the manner in which Daniel exhibited the fraud of those who eat the enormous feast, which the people believed to be necessary for the idol.

Suetonius tells us, that when Augustus lost a number of ships in a storm, he was so angry with Neptune, that he ordered his statue should not be carried in procession with those of the other gods, at the next celebration of the Circensian games. (Aug. 16.) Tacitus, at the close of his book iv. of history, gives a pretty specimen of the manner in which the people of Egypt and of Sinope regarded an idol, which of its own accord went on board the Egyptian vessel, when the people of Sinope refused their permission for its removal.

Several of those idols were said to have been sent down from heaven; and whosoever reads the eighth chapter of *Ezekiel*, will have abundant evidence of the prevarication of Judea. Not to revert to the idol of Beelzebub, which was consulted in Accaron, nor that of Apollo at Delphos, nor so many others, I shall exhibit a passage from the prophet *Zachary*, chapter x.:

"For the idols have spoken vanity, and the diviners have seen a lie, and have told false dreams."

I believe that what has been already adduced, is confirmed by your own following of Beza's translation of verse 35, chapter xix. of the *Acts of the Apostles*, in which Demetrius is made to say, that the statue of Diana at Ephesus, was let down from Jupiter. St. Augustin, in lib. iii., *De Doct. Christ.*, chapter 7, says: "I confess, they are more besotted who look upon the works of men's hands to be gods, than they who imagine the works of God to be such." Again he states two various classes. "They worship idols, either as gods, or as signs and images of gods." And Eusebius: "Hesiod thinks that there are thirty thousand gods on earth, but I see that there are many more wooden and stone creators of men." Hermes Trismegistus, as quoted by St. Augustine, lib. viii., chapter 23, *De civit. Dei*, is asked by Asclepius if he calls the statues gods, to which he answers, "Yes, the statues, Asclepius, animated with sense, and full of spirit, and foretelling what men cannot foreknow," and so forth, "bestowing good and evil," and so forth. Arnobius writes, l. 6, chapter 27, that the heathens did not adore the metal

of the idol, but the divinity which came to dwell in it upon its dedication; and upon this ground the various statements of the speaking and acting of images were not so revolting to these people, as they necessarily must be to us.

I have now shown some grounds for the statement which I gave of pagan idolatry. In my next I shall examine the precepts given by the living God upon this subject.

I remain, gentlemen,
Your obedient, humble servant,

B. C.

LETTER X.

Not so the mind that has been touched from heaven,
And in the school of sacred wisdom taught
To read his wonders, in whose thought the world,
Fair as it is, existed ere it was:
Not for its own sake merely, but for his
Much more who fashion'd it, he gives it praise;
Praise that, from earth resulting, as it ought,
To earth's acknowledged Sovereign, finds at once
Its only just proprietor in Him.
. . . . . .
Much conversant with heaven, she often holds
With those fair ministers of light to man,
That fill the skies nightly with silent pomp,
Sweet conference! inquires what strains were they
With which heav'n rang, when ev'ry star in haste
To graduate the new created earth,
Sent forth a voice, and all the sons of God
Shouted for joy. *Cowper.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 3, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—Upon the present occasion, I prefer being tedious, to being indistinct. I shall, therefore, now restate summarily the criminal characteristics of pagan idolatry; they are

1. Not paying homage to God, the eternal Creator.
2. Giving divine worship to creatures.
3. Giving divine worship to devils.
4. Giving divine worship to idols.
5. Giving divine worship to imaginary beings.
6. Using unnatural, immoral, and indecent rites.

Now, gentlemen, in the Roman Catholic invocation and honouring

of saints, and veneration of images, no one of those ingredients is found. Your curious correspondent acknowledges that we do pay homage to God, the eternal Creator; and I believe we may assume that we are not charged as guilty under the sixth head. Our attention is therefore confined to the intermediate four. To understand a proposition, we ought to know the meaning of its terms. There is one term common to each of those four propositions, viz., the attribute divine worship. And if we come to an agreement as to the meaning of this term, our whole difficulty is at an end. Now the pagans made no distinction between the worship due to any two of their superior gods, for instance, Neptune and Pluto. So far as the mental act is concerned, they gave divine worship to each; that is, the worship due to God, by praying to him as an independent and original deity, who immediately, of his own motion, and from his own sources, and by his own power, bestowed what he gave. They did not consider it necessary for Neptune to ask from Jupiter what was demanded by his votary, nor did that votary ask of Neptune to intercede, or to pray with him to Jupiter, for what was considered Neptune's own gift; nor, if it was bestowed, was the gratitude considered as due to Jupiter, but only to Neptune. To Neptune was the altar raised, to him was the priest consecrated, to him was the sacrifice offered, to him were all the acts of homage done, all terminating in him alone, without reference to any superior. This is divine worship, or the worship due to the divinity, due only to God. And this homage was paid to every one of their deities by the pagans.

In order to have accurate notions of the meaning of words, we should first have accurate notions of the things which they signify. Worship is an act of the mind; sometimes it is outwardly expressed, but the mere outward expression is not worship: the same ceremony or deed which accompanies or expresses the mental act, if performed without that mental act itself, would not be worship, but hypocrisy; so far from being true homage, it would be mockery. Thus, the source of worship, the seat of worship, must be found in the mind. The etymology of the word itself will here, as in many other cases, greatly help us to discover the exact idea which it expresses. It is a compound word,—worth, with the old Saxon termination, ship, which signified "office," "employment," or "condition;" the worth signified "value," "excellence," "importance:" hence worship is properly "a condition of excellence," and to worship is of course mentally to appreciate the excellence of the condition of any being, and after knowing our relation in its regard, to do those acts which that relation demands. The expression is a generic one, and regards various beings in their several degrees of excel-

lence: hence Johnson gives its first meaning, as a verb active, "to adore," "to honour or venerate with religious rites,"—its second "to respect," "to honour," "to treat with civil deference,"—its third "to treat with amorous respect." Hence it is obvious that worship in the English language, either as a noun or as a verb active, denotes a mental act, in which one reasonable being regards the various excellence of others, and treats them accordingly: that it means various kinds of respect to those others, as their excellence varies, and that one kind thereof is due to God for his excellence, and this is divine worship. And since only the eternal God has this sort of excellence, it is not lawful to give divine worship to any other being; hence the heathens, who gave it to devils, to idols, to any other creatures, or to imaginary beings, were therein highly criminal; and for so doing they are condemned by Roman Catholics. This condemnation and explanation ought, in common justice, form a good *prima facie* case, to save Roman Catholics themselves from the charge of idolatry, and strong testimony ought to be required to make them even suspected.

It is now clear that in the English language, the word worship is by no means restricted to express the homage due to God, unless it be accompanied by the adjunct divine. Let us then, for clearness' sake, call the act of divine worship, adoration. It is true that Johnson states adoration to be "the external homage paid to the divinity, distinct from mental reverence;" but it is lawful to differ even from the great bibliographer himself, and I humbly apprehend that neither of the examples which he adduces will bear him out; the following are the passages:

"Solemn and serviceable worship we name, for distinction sake, whatsoever belongeth to the church (or public society) of God, by way of external adoration." —*Hooker.*

"It is possible to suppose, that those who believe a supreme excellent Being, may yet give him no external adoration at all."—*Stillingfleet.*

Now in each of those instances, if Johnson is correct, Hooker and Stillingfleet were guilty of very glaring tautology, for if adoration be the external act, as distinct from the mental, each of those very accurate writers has given us the very curious phrase of an "external, external act," by prefixing the word external to adoration. I apprehend the examples would go to show that adoration was the mental act of reverence to the Divinity, which, when manifested by "solemn and serviceable worship," became external. And hence I apprehend that the true genius of the English language exhibits adoration to be that species of mental and external worship which is due to the divinity, in the strict and primitive meaning of the term. The word is one adopted from the Latin,

"*adoratio,*" which was appropriately used to signify the homage paid by the Pagans to their divinities by kissing the hand, or placing it on their mouth whilst they approached or saluted the idols; hence the homage of the divinity was known by the phrase *apponere manus ad ora*, or *adorare*. Hence, according to your own version, Job, in vindicating himself from idolatry, says, (xxxi. 26, 27, 28),

"If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness; and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand; this also were in iniquity to be punished by the judge: for I should have denied the God that is above."

I suspect you will find a slight mistake, and perhaps not accidental, in your translation of *I Kings* xix. 18, where the Lord says,—

Protestant version. "Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed to Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him."

Catholic version. (*III Kings* xix. 18). "And I will leave me seven thousand men in Israel, whose knees have not bowed before Baal, and every mouth that hath not worshipped him, kissing hands."

I apprehend, gentlemen, that you would find some difficulty in showing, that the worshippers of Baal were allowed to kiss the idol, though you would find none whatever in proving that Baal was adored by their kissing of hands, as well as by kneeling, passing through fire, and so forth.

By adoration, then, we mean that mental act by which a reasonable creature estimates to the best of its power, the infinite excellence of the Creator, preferring him infinitely beyond all his works, humbling itself in his presence, acknowledging its dependence upon him, desiring to be united to him as the source of perfection, believing his declarations, anxious to fulfill his will, and ready to use all efforts in its execution. This divine worship is due to God alone: the manifestation of this in "solemn serviceable worship" is external adoration.

We have previously seen that worship, as a mental act, had several objects, indeed it must be of as many kinds as there were classes of reasonable beings in various conditions of worth or excellence, and yet in the manifestation of those several corresponding degrees of respect, man was confined to a very few external acts; hence frequently we find the same individual perform the very same external acts of respect to beings of very different degrees of excellence, and towards whom he stood in very different relations. I shall here adduce a few instances.

1. *Abraham, respecting three angels, appearing as men.*

Catholic version. (*Genesis* xviii, 2). "And as soon as he saw them, he ran to meet them from the door of his tent, and adored down to the ground."

Protestant version. "And when he saw them, he ran to meet them from the tent door, and bowed himself towards the ground."

2. *Lot, respecting the two angels, coming to Sodom.*

Catholic version. (*Genesis* xix. 1). "And seeing them, he rose up and went to meet them: and worshipped prostrate to the ground."

Protestant version. "And Lot seeing them, rose up to meet them, and bowed himself with his face towards the ground."

3. *Abraham, respecting the children of Heth.*

Catholic version. (*Genesis* xxiii. 7). "Abraham rose up, and bowed down to the people of the land."

Protestant version. "And Abraham stood up and bowed himself to the people of the land."

Catholic version. (v. 12). "Abraham bowed down, before the people of the land."

Protestant version. "And Abraham bowed down himself before the people of the land."

4. *Abraham on the mountain going to sacrifice.*

Catholic version. (*Genesis* xxii. 5). "And after we have worshipped will return to you."

Protestant version. "Will go yonder and worship and come again."

5. *Abraham's servant in Mesopotamia.*

Catholic version. (*Genesis* xxiv. 26). "The man bowed himself down, and adored the Lord."

Protestant version. "And the man bowed down his head and worshipped the Lord."

Catholic version. (v. 52). "Which when Abraham's servant heard, falling down to the ground, he adored the Lord."

Protestant version. "When Abraham's servant heard their words, he worshipped the Lord bowing himself to the earth."

Now, in those several passages we have in the Hebrew, the self-same verb for the several acts of respect, to God, to men, and to angels; the translators who produced the Septuagint, faithfully adhere, in this instance, to the Hebrew, and give us also the same verb. Yet no person will undertake to say that the respect was the same, for in No. 4 we have the supreme or divine worship due to God, as in both parts of No. 5; in both of No. 3, we have only the worship due to the children of Heth, whilst in No. 1 and No. 2 we have the worship paid to three angels by Abraham, and by Lot to two. I shall not here stop to remark upon some very curious variations in the mode of bowing down, which are to be seen upon comparing your translation with the original and some of the ancient versions. I shall content myself with stating what I believe is evident, that the external act which is described by an unchanging verb, was the same in all cases, but that the nature of the internal act varied, with the mental respect intended to be paid by him who gave the homage. When Abraham bowed down to the people of the land, it was human worship, not divine worship, when he or his servant bowed down to God, it was divine worship, not human worship, and when Abraham

or Lot bowed down to the angels, it was not divine worship, nor was it human worship, for they bowed neither to God, nor to man.

I am quite aware of its being said that one of the angels was the second person of the Trinity, and that Abraham with this knowledge, worshipped him, and therefore this was the worship of God, not of an angel. I am just as well disposed to concede as to dispute the assertion: and will argue upon its supposed truth. In this case Abraham knew that the two who accompanied the divine person were not gods nor men, and yet the text makes no discrimination as to their mode of treatment: nor have we sufficient scriptural evidence to sustain the assertion, that one was the Son of God, but there is indeed a vague tradition to that effect. It is true that in the course of the chapter Abraham converses with the Lord; and only two angels subsequently appear to Lot; if, then, the eternal Son had sent his two angelic companions to Sodom, whilst he conversed with Abraham: in No. 2, we have only those two angels; suppose I again admit, in this place, in order to concede everything which can be demanded, that Lot mistaking them for men, paid only human worship; I shall have obtained all that I sought for, which is, that worship is an internal act, expressed sometimes by an external deed, that the degrees of worship vary with the gradations of that rational excellence which calls for our esteem, that frequently the same external act will express several degrees of respect, and, therefore, that the mere similarity of the outward action in any two given cases, is not sufficient evidence of the same description of homage or worship being paid in those cases. When to this consideration we add the fact, that in early languages, especially in Hebrew, there is a comparative dearth of words, we must necessarily feel, that one word will frequently express several ideas, which are to be distinguished only by circumstances. Upon all those grounds it is a natural conclusion, that the Hebrews who, by the outward act of "bowing down," manifested their respect for God, for men, and for intermediate or angelic beings, should express all those several degrees and sorts of respect by the verb "to bow down," and thus has arisen that ambiguity and equivocation, which has afforded room to obscure and to perplex what would otherwise appear simple and plain.

Then every species of worship is not divine worship, and it is lawful to give to human beings, by reason of their excellence, human worship, as it is lawful to give to God, because of his excellence, divine worship. The second is demanded by religion and it is hence called a species of religious worship, the first is not demanded by religion, but by the reason of civilized society, and is therefore called a species of

civil worship. They might both in several instances be expressed by the same external act, which being equivocal, is explained in each case by the circumstances. It is clear then that although divine worship be due to God alone, yet inferior worship might be paid to creatures, and the criminality of the pagan consisted in paying divine worship to others instead of God. The manner in which it is attempted to convict Roman Catholics of ilodatry, is by endeavouring to prove that though they worship God, yet that they also give divine worship to creatures. It is said by our opponents, and among others by your curious correspondent, that every species of religious worship is divine worship, and that our acknowledgement, that we do give religious worship to creatures, is evidence that we do give them divine worship. This is as good logic as any miserable play upon a word can exhibit. Our answer is short. If all religious worship be divine worship, then we do not give them religious worship; but if there be various descriptions of religious worship, of which divine worship is the principal, then we, in giving a different description from that which is divine, do not pay divine worship, so that the whole question resolves itself into the inquiry, whether there can be a religious worship, which is not divine.

We have previously seen what is meant by divine worship. We are now brought to inquire what is the meaning of the word religious. Religion, properly speaking, means "a double or repeated bond;" it is that strict tie, by which we are bound to the service of God. Thus, Johnson defines it, "virtue as founded upon reverence of God, and expectation of future reward or punishment." The first object of religion is undoubtedly God. Hence, all proper acts done through reverence of God are religious, and if through reverence for God, other actions than those which regard him, as their immediate object, be done, it is clear that they are founded upon that reverence of him, and therefore, if they be in their own nature good, they will also be religious acts. Thus a man who sees his fellow-creature in distress, and being moved with human pity, relieves him, does an act of humanity or of human virtue, which though good, yet is not a religious act, because it has no immediate reference to God, but to man, and to human feelings: but if upon seeing this distressed person, he through reverence of God, and in accordance with his precept of mercy, bestows the necessary aid, it is then an act of religion. Religious is, therefore, that which is done through reverence for God. When we worship God himself, it is an act of religion, and is divine worship; but if through reverence to God, we pay worship to some excellent being nearly connected with the Almighty, it clearly is religious; but not being such as we would

pay to God himself, it is not divine. I shall adduce a few instances which will illustrate my positions. We read in *Josue* v., in both versions, that Josue saw one whom he thought to be a man, standing opposite him with a drawn sword:

Catholic version. "13. And he went to him, and said, Art thou one of ours or of our adversaries?

"14. And he answered: No: but I am a prince of the host of the Lord; and now am I come.

"15. Josue fell on his face to the ground, and worshipping said: what saith my lord to his servant?

"16. Loose, saith he, thy shoes from thy feet; for the place whereon thou standest is holy: And Josue did as was commanded him."

Protestant version. "13. Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us or for our adversaries.

"14. And he said, nay; but as captain of the host of the Lord am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship and said unto him, What saith my lord unto his servant?

"15. And the captain or the Lord's host said to Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy. And Joshua did so."

Now it is very clear that Josue did not here pay mere human or civil worship, and it is equally clear that he did not pay divine worship: for it was more than he would pay to a man, but less than he would pay to God. And what was its motive? The civil station of the angel? No! the exalted place of one so nearly connected with God, as to be captain of his host; and one of the blessed attendants before his throne, as well as his envoy to his people. Josue then viewed him as peculiarly connected with God; and through reverence for God he worshipped him: thus it is religious worship, though not divine worship, and even the common and inanimate place, from its connexion with God by those circumstances, became holy, and the reverence of taking off the shoes, though not divine worship, was religious respect, or veneration.

It was religious worship, not divine which Balaam paid to the angel, (*Numbers* xxii. 31). In like manner when your version informs us, (*Daniel* ii. 46), that King Nebuchodonosor "fell on his face and worshipped Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odours to him," they paid him religious worship, as God's friend and messenger, but not divine worship, for the king declares that Daniel's "God is a God of gods," and the next verse informs us that the king made Daniel a great man, "a ruler over the entire provinces of Babylon," and so forth.

In like manner Obadiah, as he is named in your version, who was a man in high rule, owed no civil respect to Elias, or Elijah, as you have

the name, a poor humble man, and yet we read in your book, *I Kings*, our III; xviii. 7.

"And as Obadiah was in the way, behold Elijah met him; and he knew him and fell on his face, and said, Art thou that my lord, Elijah?"

The respect which Abdias or Obadiah here paid to the prophet was owing to his reverence of God, to whom the prophet belonged, and with whom he was connected. And in like manner, good gentlemen, when your reverend clergy, who have no civil prerogatives, nor civil place in our state, are placed in seats of honour, and first in our processions, and receive all those attentions to their comfort, which every man knows how to prize, it is because of their sacred character: that is, their connexion with the Deity, whose ministers they are; hence it is the courtesy of a religious people, of a people who respect religion, or the service of God: and of course respect its ministers; it is all religious, it is done through reverence of God. In like manner it was neither civil nor divine, but religious worship which the sons of the prophets paid to Eliseus, or as you call him, Elisha, in *II* or *IV Kings* ii. 15.

"And when the sons of the prophets which were to view at Jericho saw him, they said, The spirit of Elijah doth rest on Elisha. And they came to meet him, and bowed themselves to the ground before him."

Catholic version. "And the sons of the Prophets at Jericho, who were over against him, seeing it, said: The spirit of Elias hath rested upon Eliseus. And coming to meet him they worshipped him, falling to the ground."

Here we have the very same Hebrew and Greek words, for the worship, that were used in the places before cited, as well as in *Exodus* xx. 5, in the commandment of forbiding "to adore strange gods," and in *Exodus* xxiii. 24, forbidding the worship of the gods of the Gentiles; in the same book xiv. 1, where the Israelites are commanded to worship God, at a distance from the mountain; xxxi. 8, where they worship the calf; in xxxiii. 10, where they worship God; in xxxiv. 8, where Moses worships God; and in a vast number of other places, for various meanings of divine, religious and civil worship. I should hope, that, after those few instances and explanations, I may be permitted to assert, that, besides divine worship or adoration which is due to God alone, there has been exhibited by his faithful and unreproved servants, by scriptural evidence, other religious worship paid to his angelic and human friends, and ultimately referable to himself; and honour, as well as civil worship paid to people, and rulers, and others in civil offices, not specially referable to God, nor to his honour, but to the courtesies of civilized life and civil society; and all these sorts of worship were paid by the same sort of ceremony in various instances, and have been, in the Scriptures, described by the same identical verb, not only in

Hebrew, but also in Greek of the Septuagint, and generally in the Chaldaic paraphrase. Thus, there is a lesser kind of religious worship than that which is due only to God, and which, though given to creatures, is referable to God; for it is given, because of reverence for him. Thus, the Lord himself cautions the Israelites (*Exodus* xxiii. 20, and so forth) respecting their conduct towards the angel who was to guide them, for not only was he his messenger and friend, but his "name was in him."

It is clear, then, that when we pay this minor or subordinate religious worship to creatures who are God's friends, that we do not give divine worship to creatures nor to devils; and we do not pay divine worship to idols, when we pay to images veneration similar to that which the great Josue paid to the holy place, and to that which God commanded to be paid to his sanctuary. (*Levit.* xix. 30).

"Ye shall keep my Sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary, I am the Lord."

In fact, we do not pay to sacred images any veneration so great, as the people of Israel paid to the ark with the images of cherubim; neither do we pay divine worship to imaginary beings.

Thus, having fully investigated the nature of pagan idolatry, and the nature of the lawful practices of the Israelites, and seen something of the genius of their language, it only remains to inquire what their peculiar situation was, and whether they were forbidden to make images.

They had come from Egypt, which was pre-eminently a land of gross idolatry, in which several of themselves had indulged, and to which they had still so strong an inclination, that we find them easily drawn into its practice, as well by their own propensity, as by the persuasions of the idolatrous women with whom they associated; and they were going to occupy a land from which a most profligately idolatrous race was to be ejected; and were to be surrounded, still, by hosts of inimical and insidious idolaters. God was desirous of preserving amongst them the knowledge of his pure, spiritual nature, and to guard them from contamination. He showed not himself to them under any bodily shape, for he desired to impress upon their minds his pure spirituality; yet he did not forbid their making images, because he showed Moses a pattern of some which he was to make, and to place upon the ark in the sanctuary, and which he did so make and place; but they were not likenesses of God, but of his attendants and friends.

Let us now see the precept as recorded in *Exodus* xx:

Catholic version. "1. And the Lord spoke all these words:

"2. I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

"3. Thou shalt not have strange gods before me.

"4. Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth.

"5. Thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them; I am the Lord thy God, mighty, jealous."

Protestant version. "1. And God spake all these words, saying,

"2. I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

"3. Thou shall have no other gods before me.

"4. Thou shall not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.

"5. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God," and so forth.

Roman Catholics look upon all this to form one law or precept, in which the preamble is a declaration of the right and claim of the great legislator, which is contained in verse 2; then a general prohibition, in verse 3, of polytheism, and of abandoning his worship; then, in verse 4, is a special enumeration of the particulars in which they were most likely to be tempted, and those are specially prohibited: these specialties are of two kinds, graven thing, which is not, strictly speaking, an image or likeness, as having no prototype; and next likeness or image, distributed into three classes—objects in the heavens, the stars, and so forth; in the earth, such as men, beasts, and so forth; in the waters, such as fishes, and so forth. After this, follows the prohibition in verse 5, which, unless it be considered as restraining the terms of verse 4, will cause the enactment therein to prohibit what God orders, in *Exodus* xxv. 18, And thou shalt make two cheribums of gold; and would thus make God contradict himself. But this difficulty ceases as soon as we view verse 5, restraining the general expression of verse 4, for, in that case, the precept will be, "you shall not make idols nor images for the purpose of giving them divine worship;" and it will be admirably in keeping with verse 3, "Thou shalt not have strange gods, or other gods before me." Thus would every species of pagan idolatry be prohibited effectually, and the making of images, or copies of known prototypes; and the regarding them with that respect and veneration which was demanded from the people of Israel, towards the ark and its images, would be permitted; for we read in your version, *I Samuel,* or *I Kings* vi. 19, that fifty thousand and threescore and ten of the men of Bethshemesh were smitten by the Lord because they looked into the ark; and in *II Samuel* vi. 7, that the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah or Ozias, so that the Lord

slew him, for merely taking hold of the ark when it was shaken by the oxen who were carrying it; as, through reverence for God, none but the priests were permitted to touch it. We do not require such veneration for our images; and yet it was not only lawful in Judea, but required by God himself; and, consequently, his precept must not be extended to forbid what he plainly requires.

One remark more upon your translation of verse 4 might not be amiss. If the original bore you out, in giving us "graven images" and "likenesses," and they both mean the same thing, the original precept would have two serious legal faults; first, there would be unmeaning repetition; and next, there would be no clause prohibiting the making of those fanciful figures which had no prototypes, and which are peculiarly called idols, and which were the most dangerous snare to the people. But, gentlemen, the fault is not in the original, nor is it in the Pentateuch, nor is it in the Vulgate, nor in the Chaldiac. The whole merit and credit is due to persons who, after an interval of fifteen centuries, were, perhaps, specially gifted to discover what has previously escaped the observation of the world.

I shall, in my next, again pay my respects to your friend with the contradictory name, and remain, gentlemen,

Your obedient, humble servant,

B. C.

LETTER XI.

And furious Albion flings his hasty dart:
'Twas feathered from a bee's transparent wing,
And its shaft ended in a hornet's sting;
But tossed in rage, it flew without a wound,
High o'er the toe, and guiltless pierced the ground.

Tickell.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 10, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—It is now clearly seen to be the doctrine of Roman Catholics, that divine worship is to be paid only to the eternal God: but that it is lawful to pay inferior religious worship to angels and saints, because of their intimate connexion with God, as deriving from him their sancity and glory; and that the honour paid to them is referable to God, and like every other act of religion, is dictated by reverence for him. Civil worship is paid in civil society; that of the highest grade, to presidents, governors, kings, emperors, and so forth; then to the var-

ious subordinate officers, according to their rank and the regulation of the state: the honour or dishonour given to an ambassador or public officer of any nation, is felt by his government and fellow-citizens, as given to themselves: and the disrespect or obedience shown by any citizen to a public officer of the country, is looked upon as shown to the state itself. No sophistry, no ingenuity can eradicate this feeling, which is so immediate a consequence of first principles as to be in a manner identified with them.

There is no language perfect, and it is only by gradual process each tongue approaches to perfection. There are various acts of the mind which we can feel to be very distinct, for which we have scarcely as yet, distinct, appropriate expressions: in early times, in the infancy of language, this imperfection was much greater. Hence it was, that although in Hebrew, and other old dialects, we have expressions which signify the external act of adoration, we have no word which peculiarly and exclusively expresses the internal act, and the word "bow down," is used for this and for a great variety of other acts, wherefore in these tongues it would be folly to expect distinct phrases to signify the distinct mental acts, for expressing each of which only two words "bow" and "serve" were used, one signifying a ceremony, the other signifying a state of occupation, neither designating a mental act.

We have also seen that the ceremony which, amongst the Greek pagans, was usually practised in worship, was kissing the hand to the object which was honoured: hence their word was a compound of προς "to" and κυω "I kiss," their expression then προσκυνησις was used as the translation of the Hebrew. It might be a question whether the second part of the compound might not have been a corruption of κυπτω "I bow down." Be that as it may, the word expressed a ceremony, and not a mental act. The Greeks used also the word λατρευω, "I serve," which some derived from λατρις, an acquired servant, others from λα which signifies excess, and τρευω "I tremble," hence this was also an external act. In process of time those two words came amongst the Greeks to signify divine worship, and were correlative to the Hebrew words; they also used the word δουλευω, "I serve," from δουλος, "a menial servant." They had no word to express the mental act.

Amongst the Latins we find the same dearth: *adoratio*, which meant "putting the hand to the mouth," and *vereor*, "I fear," "I reverence," which comes nearer to the expression of a mere mental act than any other, but it was seldom, if ever, used to signify worship, but another word not unlike it in structure, though greatly dissimilar in derivation,

veneror was quite usual: this was supposed to be a compound of *veniam*, "favour," and *oro*, "I ask:" upon the same ground, I was greatly inclined to suspect that *adoratio*, might be a compound of ad "to," and *oratio*, "prayer;" but the universal and clear evidence as to the fact, of the mode of worshipping by putting the hand to the mouth, and all the old testimonies were too strong against this surmise. The verb *colo*, had various meanings; its original and primitive meaning was to "till or cultivate the ground," which was a servile occupation, and also beneficial; amongst several subsequent, accidental meanings, that of "paying court" to human beings and "worshipping the gods" were added. St. Augustin, who was an excellent grammarian informs us, that even in his day, A. D. 420, there was in Latin, no special word to signify the peculiar worship due to God alone. Hence, though there was a distinction of worship, there was not precision of language. That precision in religious language was generally the consequence of disputes arising from difference of doctrine or of opinion.

Those differences in the Christian Church, gave rise to an appropriation of the words more by common usage, than by authoritative appointment; and hence, as the λατρις was a higher servant than the δουλος, his services were of a more honourable kind, and λατρεια was considered a higher worship than δουλεια. Amongst the Latins, *colo* was a sort of generic expression, of which *adoratio* was the highest description, *veneratio* was a lesser; and thus the former words λατρεια and *adoratio* were used to express divine worship; and the latter δουλεια and *veneratio*, to express that lesser religious worship which we give to angels and saints. Thus at present we feel that the origin of worship is in the mind: the understanding must first appreciate the value of the object; the will next assents to this estimation, and determines to pay the worship, which is frequently done only by interior acts of homage, and mental devotion, such as prayer, gratitude, pure love of charity, praise, and so forth, which all are done in the recesses of the heart; or they may be subesquently expressed by outward acts, such as vocal prayer or ceremonial worship. In English we give the common name of religious worship, to all that which is paid to God, or to what is immediately connected with him. When it is paid to himself, the understanding appreciates him, alone, eternal, the source of all good, above all estimable value, with no equal; the will desires to give him the highest honour and the most perfect worship terminating in himself, as alone the best and highest. This we call *adoration*, the school term for which is *latria*.

When worship is paid to an angel or saint, the understanding views

and appreciates him as a created, dependent, limited being, raised by God to some high grade of virtue and excellence, by reason of which he deserves our esteem; it also considers him as a permanent friend of God, united to him by charity, partaking in a limited degree of his holiness, protected, loved, cherished and upheld by God, and a benevolent fellow-worshipper with us, who can intercede on our behalf with that God, to whom we both pray,—whom we both adore. The will then desires to honour this friend of God, though reverence for God himself; and therefore religiously; we call this religious honour or veneration, and if we ask the intercession of the being whom we thus honour, we call it invocation: thus we say that "angels and saints may be honoured and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God, on our behalf;" the school term for this, is *dulia*; and as God has more highly favoured the blessed Virgin, we honour her more than we do any other saint; the term is an extension of *dulia*, and is called *hyperdulia*, or, an honour of the highest kind given to a creature.

When we make images, our object is, by their aid to impress our minds more deeply, that we may be excited better to pay the due worship to those whom they represent: we do not look upon them as possessing any virtue in themselves, nor as able to help or hear us; they are not therefore idols.

When we worship before an image of Christ, if the mind be carried away to Christ himself, the worship we pay is *latria* or adoration; we only regard the great original, of whom the image reminds us.

When we worship before the image of a saint, or representation of an angel, if the mind be carried altogether to the prototype, our worship is *dulia*, greater or lesser, as we appreciate the object, which it represents.

If we consider the image itself, as in some degree connected with the service of God, and formed to aid us, in elevating our mind to contemplate heavenly things, it acquires in our estimation, a sort of value like that of the ark with its cherubim, like that which you yourselves give to your communion cups, which you would not place upon your table for every day use, through reverence for God, in whose service they are used, and to which they are devoted, lest you might provoke him, as did the monarch of Babylon. (*Daniel* v. 3). To steal them is, by you, viewed not as common theft, but sacrilege. We call this religious veneration, as we call family veneration, that respect and attachment which we feel towards our family pieces. And as we call civil veneration, that respect which is paid to the statues or images of General Washington, of William Penn, and other great benefactors of the civilized world.

As through civil respect, and not for mere decoration, our Congress has placed in its Hall of Representatives, the picture of General Lafayette, the benefactor of our country; so through religious respect, for a purpose beyond that of mere decoration, we place in our churches, the pictures of holy men, and holy women; the benefactors of the Christian community, whom they edified by their virtues; whom they instructed by their examples.

I now return to your correspondent. In his 23d paragraph, he has the question:

"Now whether it be *Latria,* or anything else, does not the sense of the Roman Catholic Church seem plainly to be, that religious honour should be paid to images?"

And further down the following assertion:

"His *dulia* might be an inferior worship; but if it was worship at all, it was idolatry."

There is not a child that has learned its Catechism in our Church, which could not feel that the whole force of the sophism, was centered in the ambiguity of the phrases, worship in the last, and religious honour, in the first. Nay, your correspondent himself admits the sufficiency of our distinction, in the following passage of paragraph 25:

"We should not hesitate to admit that there are among them many who are capable of the elevated abstraction of enlightened piety, which saves them from any necessity or danger of rendering in their hearts, any honour which is due to God, to the image of his creature. But we must be permitted to doubt whether the multitude of Roman Catholic worshippers are not thus subjected to a temptation of having their spiritual conversation more on earth than in heaven."

Then in fact, provided we be "capable of the elevated abstraction of enlightened piety"—he says, that we commit no idolatry; for then we do not give "any honour which is due to God, to the image of his creature." If I at all understand this; he deserts his own sophism, and admits our distinction. He only fears that our ignorant multitude will not be so elevatedly, abstractedly enlightened. Upon that score, gentlemen, you may soothe his troubled soul; for our multitude are taught either in words or substantially, the following chapter of the *Catechism,* which they are made distinctly to understand.

LESSON XVIII. *First Commandment, continued.*

"Q. What else is forbidden by the first commandment?

A. To give to any creature the honour due to God.

Q. Are we forbidden to honour saints?

A. No; if we honour them but as God's special friends and faithful servants, and do not give them supreme or divine honour of adoration, which belongs to God alone.

Q. How do Catholics distinguish between the honour which they give to God, and the honour which they give to the saints, as they pray to both?

A. Of God alone they beg grace and mercy; and of the saints they only ask the assistance of their prayers. (*Tobias* xi. 12).

Q. Is it lawful to recommend ourselves to the angels and saints, and to ask their prayers?

A. Yes; since by doing so, we may be heard by them, and obtain their prayers in addition to our own. (*Luke* xv. 7).

Q. Can the blessed spirits in heaven know when we pray to them?

A. Yes; And there shall be joy before the angels of God, upon one sinner doing penance. (*Luke* xv. 10).

Q. Do the blessed spirits interest themselves in our behalf?

A. Yes; and have frequently done so, with great zeal and effect. (*Zach.* i. 10, 12).

Q. Does it not take from the honour due to God and infringe upon the merits of Christ, to pray to angels and saints as intercessors?

A. No; it does not, as it does not take from the honour due to God to pay respect to our parents and superiors, nor infringe upon the merits of Christ to ask the prayers of our fellow-creatures upon earth, and to pray for them. (*Thessal.* v. 25; *James* v. 16).

Q. Why do Catholics kneel before the images of Christ and his saints?

A. To honour Christ and his saints, whom these images represent. (*Exod.* xxv).

Q. Is not the making of images, and the bowing down before them, forbidden by the first commandment?

A. The making of images is not forbidden by the first commandment; for God ordered Moses to make images.—(*Exod.* xxv).—and the people bowed down before them in prayer in the Jewish Temple. (2 *Paralip.* iii).

Q. What use of images is forbidden by the first commandment?

A. That use which idolaters made of them when they served them as gods.

Q. Is it proper to show any mark of respect to the crucifix, and to the pictures of Christ and his saints?

A. Yes; because they relate to Christ and his saints, being representations and memorials of them. (*Acts* xix. 12; *Matt.* ix. 21).

Q. Why do Catholics honour the relics of the saints?

A. Because their bodies had been the temples of the Holy Ghost; and after their resurrection will be honoured and glorified for ever in heaven.

Q. May we then pray to the crucifix, or to the images or relics of the saints?

A. By no means; for they have neither life nor sense, nor power to hear or help us.

Q. Why then do we pray before the crucifix, and before the images and relics of the saints?

A. Because they enliven our devotion, by exciting pious affections and desires —and by reminding us of Christ and his saints. (*Exod.* xxv. 18; *John* iii. 14).

Q. Is there anything else forbidden by the first commandment?

A. Yes; all attempts at dealing and communication with the devil; and inquiring after things lost, hidden, or to come by improper means.

Q. Is it also forbidden to give credit to dreams, to fortune-telling, and the like superstitions?

A. Yes; and all incantations, charms, and spells; and superstitious observations of omens; and such foolish remarks, are also very sinful.''—*Catechism of the Roman Catholic Faith.*

Now at least his holy anxiety may cease, and perhaps it might not be amiss to inform him for the greater consolation of his spirit, that the writer of this, although he has had pretty ample opportunity of mixing amongst the young and the ignorant of various Catholic nations, never yet found one of them who had not "elevated abstraction of enlightened piety" sufficient to know that the honour due to the eternal God, was not to be paid to an image; perhaps one or two illustrations would help to make it appear that he does not speculate. The first is a very painful avowal. He has more than once had occasion to inquire, whether there was any truth in particular assertions made by persons differing from him in religion, where the names and places of abode were stated, of those who were said to be as ignorant as our multitude is here represented to be, and he uniformly found the statement to be totally false. Those occurrences are not new, nor unusual: they are like the statement made some time since by the holy men who were employed to distribute Bibles in the sixth ward, New York; that they found with one family, believed to be Irish, a Catholic Bible, in which the second commandment was omitted. The corporation of the Seminary pledged themselves to pay a sum of five hundred dollars to the Bible Society, or to any person who would produce such a Bible. The propagators of the falsehood did not accept the offer, nor retract the falsehood. The notions of our multitude upon this subject, are more accurate than are those of your correspondent himself, and it is by no means creditable to his modesty or good sense to make the charge which he has put forth. I shall bring his assertion to a practical test. I hereby pledge myself, that if within three months from the date of this letter, he shall point out any one of our multitude, black, brown, or white, that has had the opportunity to sufficient instruction, or been admitted to confirmation, or communion, who shall upon examination, be found to believe that the honour which is due exclusively to God, may be lawfully paid to any creature, living or dead; I shall, through the hands of the printer of the *Miscellany*, who will give my name if I fail, pay one hundred dollars to you, to be disposed of as your correspondent may please. Gentlemen, your correspondent might in his own estimation take this aristocratic assertion regarding the multitude, as a proof of his superior intellect; I beg to inform him, that with me at least, it always passes as a mark of quite another kind,—and the distinction which some of your writers affect to draw between our enlightened and our illiterate Catholics, is taken amongst us, by no means as a compliment: rich and poor, learned and unlearned, our doctrine is the same; we have no genteel belief, no aristocratic orthodoxy; we are all, whether emperors, kings,

popes, beggars, or slaves, members of one church, holding fast the same faith; and when any man grows so fastidious as to imagine that God Almighty revealed more or less for his negro than for himself, he ceases to be a Roman Catholic. I know not a more insulting, nor a more unfounded distinction that this, which is here insinuated. Some of our poorest people are some of those best informed in the doctrines of our church, and some of our most wealthy, are some of those most ignorant of our tenets. I have known poor children not ten years of age, who have more clear notions of the nature of idolatry, and the meaning of what you call the first two commandments, than your correspondent appears to possess.

Then if the meaning of this phrase "that all Roman Catholics intentionally violate this commandment, in rendering the due honour and veneration, which their church requires, to the images of the Virgin Mary, and so forth, should not be asserted," be, that they who do not "render in their hearts any honour which is due to God (divine worship, I presume) to the image of his creature," do not violate the precept; I will, upon a palpable fact united to this principle, claim for the Roman Catholic Church full acquittal of its violation. That palpable fact, your correspondent so far from denying, appears to admit; it is, that persons of enlightened minds capable of that abstraction which considers God and the image distinct and distinguished, do not give to the image the honour due to God, thus do act according to the true spirit of the Church. He only fears that the multitude are not capable of this abstraction. If these things be so, the spirit of the church and the conduct of its enlightened members are not in violation of the precept. The only crime then of which we would be guilty, would be imprudence in placing the images before the ignorant multitude, with the danger of their committing idolatry. But this danger does not exist, it is all fancy; it will cost me one hundred dollars if it be anything more than a mere, unfounded surmise of your correspondent. Now, since we have our own experience against his surmise, every good logician would tell us, that we must reject his conclusion, and hence, even upon his own showing, the precept is not violated in our church.

Yet still, your correspondent will not acquit us of violating the commandment, for he concludes his paragraph 25, with the following passage.

"While, however, this may be, we may confidently ask, is not the commandment violated by Roman Catholics, as a body, by the fact of their erecting images in their churches, to which it is obligatory to render honour and veneration? And if, as a body, they conscientiously obey, in this particular, the authority of their church, must

they not, as a body, violate the second commandment 'without scruple?' I see not how it can be otherwise.''

Upon this, I would remark, merely for the sake of precision, that it is not obligatory upon Catholics to render honour or veneration to images, nor to place them in churches. It is permitted, not commanded; and it is a doctrine of the church that this permission is not contrary to the law of God, but in conformity therewith. Hence the person who would neither erect nor venerate an image, would not cease to be a Catholic; but he who should assert that the erection or veneration was unlawful, would err from the Faith. It would have saved me much trouble if your correspondent used precise terms. However, perhaps he is not to blame: for terms are the expression of ideas; and where the ideas are confused, the expression cannot be accurate.

The ground upon which he endeavors to sustain his position is, that the commandment forbids what we permit. I believe we have seen that this is, to say the least of it, a great mistake. He in the same paragraph brings to the aid of his interpretation, the following texts.

Catholic version. (*Levit.* xxvi. 1). ''I am the Lord your God: you shall not make to yourself any idol or graven thing, neither shall you erect pillars, nor set up any remarkable stone in your land to adore it: for I am the Lord your God.''

Protestant version. ''Ye shall make no idols, nor graven image, neither rear up a standing image, *neither shall ye set up any image* of stone in your land, to bow down unto it: for I am the Lord your God.''

Catholic version. (*Deut.* iv). ''15. Keep therefore your souls cheerfully. You saw not any similitude in the day that the Lord God spoke to you in Horeb from the midst of fire:

''16. Lest perhaps being deceived you might make to you a graven similitude, or image of male or female.''

Protestant version. ''15. Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves; for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spoke unto you in Horeb *out of the midst of the fire*:

''16. Lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female.''

Having previously examined the text of the original precept (*Exod.* xx), and found that it did not prohibit the making images, but the making them for idolatrous purposes; and having seen, I trust clearly, that the Israelites not only innocently, but religiously held those which were made by God's command in high esteem and reverence, not for any inherent sanctity which they possess, but because of their relation to God himself; I now proceed to examine whether the text of Leviticus does prohibit more than that of Exodus appears to do. The words printed above in *italics* are found in the Protestant Bible, but not printed in the quotation of your correspondent.

I believe it will be admitted that the passage in Leviticus is not a

new enactment, but is a repetition of that in Exodus, with some more special enumerations. Your correspondent agrees with me in this, for he adduces those texts to explain and confirm the true meaning of Exodus. Now if construing *Exodus* xx. to forbid the making of an image would be a contradiction to *Exodus* xxv. 18, as we saw it manifestly would, no number of texts adduced to prove that *Exodus* xx. 4, prohibits image-making will lessen that contradiction or palliate the absurdity of such a construction. You, gentlemen, cannot do what your church declares she cannot do. Article xx. "Neither may it [the Church] so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another." In truth, this text of Leviticus is but an enumeration of two new particulars, which though not therein specially expressed, came under the general description in *Exodus* xx. 4, and the object for which they should be erected in order to come under the description of idolatry, viz. "adoration," "bowing down," is also specially expressed in *Exodus* xx. 5, as in *Leviticus* xxvi. 1.

The Catholic version exhibits to me four distinct objects of specification, idol, and graven thing, which we have previously found specified and described in Exodus, in addition to which we have here, pillar, and remarkable stone, which are new specifications. I must leave to some better intellect than mine, to distinguish the specifications of your text in its imagery, and to inform us why idol is specially introduced, if every image for a religious purpose be an idol. That it was lawful for God's servants, both before and after this prohibition of Leviticus, to erect remarkable and consecrated stones, provided they did not erect them for the purpose of adoring them, which the heathens did, I shall show by one or two Scriptural instances, and I shall adduce an outline of evidence sufficient to show that the purposes of the heathen were idolatrous, and altogether dissimilar to our object in making images of marble or other stone, which are the only kind that might come under your designation, unless a standing image be in contradiction to the cherubim which were kneeling figures, if our traditions be correct.

Jacob was not an idolater. I use your own version of *Genesis* xxviii.

"18. And Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone that he had put for his pillow and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it. 19. And he called the name of that place Bethel: but the name of the city was called Luz at the first. 20. And Jacob vowed a vow, saying, If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peace; then shall the Lord be my God: 21. And this stone which I have set for a pillar, shall be God's house," and so forth.

God did not command an idolatrous act, yet we read *Joshua* iv.

"1. And it came to pass, when all the people were clean passed over Jordan, that the Lord spake unto Joshua, saying, 2. Take you twelve men out of the people, out of every tribe a man. 3. And command them, saying, take you hence out of the midst of Jordan, out of the place where the priests' feet stood firm, twelve stones, and ye shall carry them over with you, and leave them in the lodging place, where ye shall lodge this night. . . . 8. (The children of Israel brought the stones). 9. And Joshua set up twelve stones in the midst of Jordan in the place where the priests which bare the ark of the covenant stood: And they are there to this day. . . . 20. And those twelve stones which they took out of Jordan, did Joshua pitch in Gilgal."

He then informs them of the reason, when the children should ask what mean the stones, that they should be informed,—and then for the religious purpose.

"24. That all the people of the earth might know the hand of the Lord, that it is mighty: that ye might fear the Lord your God for ever."

That is, this religious memorial preserved the recollection of the opening of the Jordan, and thus reminded the people of the power and might of God, as well as of his mercy, thus powerfully exciting to his worship. Probably you may think that the Scriptures were evidence enough, and that those stones "subjected the multitude to a temptation of having their spiritual conversation more on earth than in heaven." I can only answer, that I prefer God's wise regulation, to the surmise of a man whose name is contradiction. I have thus shown, that neither the erection of images, nor of remarkable stones was prohibited. What then was prohibited? What the heathens did. I shall give you a few specimens.

Arnobius in his work *Contra Gentes*, lig. i., writes: *Si quando conspexeram rubricatum lapidem, et ex olivi unguine lubricatum, tanquam inesset vis presens, adulabar, affabar.* "Whenever I had seen a reddened stone, and make smooth with the ointment of olives, I used to speak to it, I used to address it soothingly, as if a power was present in it."

Eusebius, (*Praepar.* lib. i. c. 10) informs us that the old Phenicians used to call stones thus prepared for worship, *Bethules.* It would be very curious to trace the history of one of those from Phenicia to Spain, thence to Ireland, thence to Scotland, and since the conquest by Edward I., preserved even for the use of the head of the English Protestant Church, after the change in religion, for the coronation chair, with which I believe it may now be found in the tower of London. Sanchoniathon traces the origin of those stones to the God of heaven, and says several of them which lived and were animated were worshipped near Libanus. Apuleius describes some of the pillars [*Florenorum initio*] which received worship. Strabo, (book xvii), describes for us

remarkable stones in all parts of Egypt as well as in Syria, which were objects of worship, like the Grecian heaps of Mercury. From the description of some of those in ancient authors, many of them appear to have been large aerolites, which naturally accounts for their heavenly origin. These were more common in Egypt, whence the Israelites were journeying; and in Syria whither they were going, than in any other place: and thus we can account for the special mention by Moses, of the pillars and remarkable stones, which are very different things from our marble or other stone images. Ours are set up for purposes similar to that of Jacob and of Josue, and do not come within the prohibition.

We now come to the text of Numbers, which corresponds to this of Leviticus, and it is not the least curious part of the subject to find the standing images, metamorphosed by your Bible into pictures.

Catholic version. (*Numbers* xxxiii. 52). "Destroy all the inhabitants of the land, beat down their pillars, and break in pieces their statues, and waste all their high places."

Protestant version. "Then ye shall drive out all the inhabitants of the land from before you, and destroy all their pictures, and destroy all their molten images, and quite pluck down all their high places."

In a quotation from Deuteronomy iv., as it appears in the essay, there is undoubtedly the appearance of an absolute prohibition of making the similitude of any male or female; however, it is perhaps, only because your correspondent feared to occupy too much valuable space, or got tired of transcribing, or fell asleep at this particular moment. Allow me to continue the passage which in each version is only interrupted by a comma, whereas he gives us a full stop. But you know, that he and I never quarrel about points.

Catholic version. "17. The similitude of any beasts, that are upon the earth, or of birds, that fly under heaven.

"18. Or of creeping things that move on the earth, or of fishes, that abide in the waters under the earth:

"19. Lest perhaps lifting up thy eyes to heaven, thou see the sun and the moon, and all the stars of heaven, and being deceived by error, thou adore and serve them, which the Lord thy God hath created for the service of all the nations that are under heaven."

Protestant version. "17. The likeness of any beast, that is on the earth, the likeness of any winged fowl that flieth in the air.

"18. The likeness of anything that creepeth on the ground, the likeness of any fish that is in the waters beneath the earth:

"19. And lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun and the moon and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldst be driven to worship them and serve them, which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all the nations under the whole heaven."

We see that the prohibition is not absolute; and as soon as the en-

tire passage is produced, we find it to contain no more than an enumeration of the special objects, which they were particularaly cautioned not to adore; together with a substantial repetition of what he commanded in *Exodus* xx. 22 and 23. You have seen that I have spoken to you from heaven. You shall not make gods of silver, nor shall you make to yourself gods of gold. And lest they should imagine he had a bodily shape, he did not exhibit himself to them under any bodily appearance, but only in fire, that they might be kept better to appreciate his spiritual nature. Hence, it is the opinion of several Catholics that the Jews were prohibited by this precept from making any statue or image of the eternal and invisible God, for any purpose whatsoever. But, even granting this to be a fair consequence of the assigned reason, it will not follow, that Christians are forbidden to make a likeness of Jesus Christ, who appeared in his human nature, in his bodily shape; of angels, who appeared as men, and of whose images God himself gave a model to Moses; of the blessed Virgin who was a visible woman, and of other saints who lived and moved in their bodies; nay even the Holy Ghost under the appearance of a dove, as you do yourselves. In fact my impression is that you have more images of the Holy Ghost and of angels in your churches in the United States that we have, and some of them so well-fed and so fat, as to testify that they were made in times of royal favour and regal munificence. And wo be to the man who would dare to go into either St. Phillip's or St. Michael's to spit upon one of the shining figures, "similitudes of things in heaven above," "graven images," though you do not adore them. Neither do we. I have in vain strained my eyes through every nook of our poor churches to discover cherub or seraph or sacred dove. I must confess onr angels are indeed spiritual and invisible! Is it then come to this, that our churches have changed sides? The churches of the Romans are bereft of image-gods, and the churches of the Protestants possess them! ! ! This probably is only a piece of Jesuitical policy. No. I must say, that I have known the Catholic Bishop use upon the occasion, the words of Shakespeare's Apothecary, "my poverty, but not my will consents." If he had the means, he says, that he would have the sacred images.

Are the Catholics of Charleston then not out of the pale of that church which as your correspondent says, makes it "obligatory on them to render honour and veneration to images of the Virgin and of the saints?" (Paragraph 25.) No! Because there is no such obligation; the practice is useful, but neither essential nor obligatory. Have they not the images of Jesus Christ crucified? Yes; it is true they have; but this is not an image of the Virgin, nor of an angel, nor of any other

saint. Do they not adore the image of Christ? No! They do not. It but reminds them of their Saviour: fixes their attention, and excites them to remember his sacrifice of atonement and seek salvation through his merits.

In the outset of his 25th paragraph your correspondent asserts what is not the fact, when he makes adoration and veneration synonymous terms: when he changes the meaning of our expressions, he misstates our doctrines, and is thus dishonest, and in this mode of argument he has indeed few superiors.

I am still detained upon his precious second essay.

I remain, gentlemen,

Your obedient, humble servant,

B. C.

LETTER XII.

For she was just, and friend to virtuous lore,
And pass'd much time in truly virtuous deed;
And in those elfins' ears would oft deplore,
The times when Truth by popish rage did bleed,
And torturous death was true devotion's meed;
And simple Faith in iron chains did mourn,
That could on wooden image place her creed;
And lawny saints in smould'ring flames did burn:
Ah! dearest Lord! forefend thilk days should e'er return.

Shenstone.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 17, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—Allow me to state what I believe has been shown. 1. That Roman Catholics pay adoration or divine worship to the eternal God, the creator of the heavens and the earth, and of all things visible and invisible. 2. That they pay divine honour or adoration to him alone. 3. Of course they do not pay divine honour to devils, 4. nor to imaginary beings, 5. nor to idols, 6. nor to human beings, living or dead; 7. nor to the images of any being, nor to any creature. 8. That they do not believe there resides any divinity or divine virtue in any image whatever. 9. That the worship of *dulia* or *hyperdulia*, or honour which they give to angels and saints is not divine honour, or adoration, but that honour which one reasonable being owes to another, because of its excellence: 10. and that the excellence of the angels and saints consists in the perfection of that nature and those graces which they received from God the Creator and Redeemer, and therefore, 11. that the

honour given to them is ultimately referable to God whose creatures they are. Hence, 12. the honour paid to them is not derogatory to that of the Creator or Redeemer, but 13. it is rather an enhancing of the same. I have also shown 14, that when our writers mention the adoration of an image, the expression is restrained to those of Jesus Christ, and that their meaning is that not the image, but the original whom the image represents, is to receive this homage: and 15, that when they use the expression of paying the worship of *dulia* or *hyperdulia* to the image of a saint, or the representation of an angel; they mean that the worship is paid to the original, through the image: yet 16, that those inanimate representations, or images, are to be treated with a degree of religious respect, which we call veneration, 17, not because of any inherent sanctity which they possess, but because of their connexion with the service of God, and through reverence for him.

I believe I have also fairly shown that almost every one of those propositions which is true of Roman Catholic worship, would be false if predicated of the worship of the heathens.

I believe I have also fairly shown that neither the text from *Exodus* xx. 4, nor that from *Leviticus* xxvi. 1, nor that from *Deuteronomy* iv. 15, 16, forbids what the Council of Trent declares to be lawful, and is fully expressed in our formulary.

"I most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, of the mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of other saints, may be had and retained; and that due honour and veneration is to be given to them."

That, and only that, is our defined doctrine. The Council of Trent was not called upon to decide, nor did it give a decision, upon either of those two questions. "Is it permitted to make an image of the invisible God?" "Is it permitted to make an image of a mere spiritual being, an angel for instance?" Yet still we can easily state what has been the general practice, and the general sentiment of the church upon those two questions. First, as to the practice respecting the image of the invisible God. Such images are not, I believe, made. Sometimes painters attempt a representation founded upon the description given in various parts of the sacred writings; to omit many others, I shall merely refer to *Isaias* vi., *Ezekiel* i., *Daniel* vii. The sentiment is, that if their intention be to represent God as really possessing that peculiar and proper appearance, it would be criminal; and to yield to such an impression would be folly; but if the painting be considered as merely emblematic or allegorical, it is not unlawful; though very unusual. As regards the second question. Images and pictures are made, which give to us the representation of the appearances which spiritual beings as-

sumed, as described in the sacred volume; not that we believe these to be their natural and usual modes of appearance, but those assumed to affect our senses, and the sentiment is universal as to its being a lawful practice; otherwise we must condemn God for giving such a direction in *Exodus* xxv. 18, and Moses and Bezeleel for making them in *Exodus* xxxvii. 7, as also Solomon and his people, *I* or *III Kings* vi., and God himself, who in chapter ix. of the same book, accepts and approves of a temple filled with such images. Our Episcopalian friends are mightily censurable for this crime, if crime it be; and I have been filled with awe and wonder at beholding over the head of a zealous independent clergyman, whilst he was praying fervently against idolatry, a beautiful graven image of the dove, representing the Spirit of God, with which the staid and demure congregation of his hearers, at the time, believed the holy man to be filled.

This view of our doctrine and practice will enable any one to see what value is due to the assertion of your correspondent, paragraph 27, that respecting heathens and Roman Catholics "the *per imagines* of the Trentine decree, puts the matter, as to the use of images, very much on the same footing, in one case as in the other." But I cannot so easily part with him even upon this score, for I should like to see the gentleman reconcile himself.

Per. "27. The next is, that Protestants say, 'Roman Catholics exculpate themselves from the charge of idolatry, not otherwise than as the heathens did.' The Council of Trent, it is true, will not allow the heathen to have even pretended to worship anything above their idols. It may, on the contrary, be safely asserted, that there is abundant evidence that they did—and that the *per imagines* of the Trentine decree, puts the matter, as to the use of images, very much on the same footing, in the one case as in the other. The testimony of several of the fathers might be given to this effect."

Contra. "23. It may be true that some Protestants, in an intemperate zeal of dissent from Popery, have considered Roman Catholics equally as idolatrous as the heathens either are or were. I believe, however, that a wide distinction is generally considered due in favour of Christian worshippers of the one only God, however incumbered their worship may be with erroneous appendages from those who, with no knowledge or belief of the one Jehovah, may worship infinitely various fictitious deities, in idols, in which they may be supposed to reside."

. . . . . .

"Voltaire, it is true, thought the heathens were no more idolaters than Roman Catholics. I would not, however, take his authority as good, against the industrious author of the essay, in the *Review*. There is a difference, and we should admit that it is important. The poor Indian either honoured his idols with a worship terminating in them, or, through them, worshipped the unknown God. Christians under the denomination of Roman Catholics, like other Christians, worship the one true God of the Scriptures."

When your correspondent shall have reconciled these passages, it will probably be necessary to support his character for honesty, to explain why, in urging this argument, in his first note to paragraph 25, he made two serious faults, in alluding to the texts mentioned in a note to the Doway Bible—and makes a very serious mistake by printing "chapter iii. 8, 7," for, "chapter xxxviii. 7," which is in the American stereotype edition, instead of xxxvii. 7, which is correct, and usual; I acquit him of all intention of dishonesty in this portion, and look upon it to be your printer's error, though we will not be allowed the mistake of a comma. He then proceeds.

"The reader, it is hoped, will turn to these passages, and see if they authorize anything like the Roman Catholic use of images in their churches. *Venite adoremus* is the express language of the *Roman Missal*: Come let us adore. Thou shalt not adore or serve them, is the language of their translation of Scripture. Roman Catholics will say they are not served; will they say that they are not adored? The language of the passage, as quoted by themselves, is, adore nor serve; not adore and serve.

The first fault is what logicians call the sophism of drawing a universal conclusion from particular premises—which denotes either a defect in the head, or one in the heart of him who uses it. The words *venite adoremus* which he quotes are used only on one day in the year, and confined to the exhibition of one image, and can by no means whatever be applied to any other. They are used on Good Friday at uncovering the image of Christ crucified. Now from his construction of this paragraph, the application is made to appear general for all images, of "the Virgin and other saints," and his context appears to put these latter and only these forward; for the paragraph begins with "In this adoration then, this due honour and veneration given to the images of the Virgin Mother of God and the saints, in their churches, do Catholics violate the second of God's commandments." Now I would be fully justified by every rule of fair criticism to restrain the meaning of his note to the extent of his paragraph, and if I did, that extent would not only not reach, but would exclude the image of Christ. Upon this ground he would be more criminal either against sound reason, or plain honesty, because he applies to images of one class, the words used not by any means for them, but for a class altogether different.

His second fault was, that with the evidence before him of the meaning and intent of the church, he not only wilfully suppressed it in this essay, though he gives it after the lapse of a month in the next, but suggested the very opposite. In pages 228, 229, of the *Missal* from which he quoted, the following note is appended at the very passage which he quotes.

"The intention of the Church in exposing the cross to our veneration on this day, is, that we might the more effectually raise up our hearts to him who expired thereon for our redemption. Whenever, therefore, we kneel or prostrate ourselves before a crucifix, it is Jesus Christ only whom we adore, and it is in him alone that our respects terminate."

What now are we to think of his honesty? I have printed the words as they are printed in the *Missal*. Even if he had not seen this note, he had in the garbled extract itself, which he says he took from Father Paul, of the decree of the Council of Trent, the distinction between the image of Christ and the images of the saints, in the separate verb applied to each: to Christ, *adoremus*; to the saints, *veneremur*; and he had also the very preposition which condemned him of dishonesty all through, *ut per imagines Christum adoremus*, "that through the images we might adore Christ," (par. 23), and therefore it was, that he laboured in paragraph 27, to prove that the pagans did not adore idols, but God through the idols, that he might put them on very much the same footing with us.

Again, he charges us with suppressing "thou shalt not adore nor serve," and yet he quotes the very words from our own Bible!! This is one way of suppressing!

After having got through this task, I shall propose to him another effort at reconciling himself to himself. In paragraph 27. The heathens are very much upon the same footing with the Roman Catholics, because he says, the assertion of the Council of Trent is not true, that they "worshipped anything above their idols." There is, he says, abundant evidence on the contrary that they did,—they adored something above the images through the images,—they worshipped God through the images. If in this they are upon very much the same footing with Roman Catholics, these latter must therefore worship God through the images, and thus God is the object of the Catholic adoration. Yet, in paragraph 24, he labours to show that Catholics do adore images, and pictures, and in paragraph 25, he asserts that they violate the second of God's commandments in this adoration given to the images: and in the note, he triumphantly asks will Roman Catholics say that the images are not adored in their churches?

After he has reconciled his assertion that it is God we adore through the image, with his assertion that it is the image we adore—he will still have to reconcile two others, viz.: that in paragraph 23, where he says that a distinction is due in our favour over the heathen, with that in 25, where he asserts that we worship the image; from which gross idolatry he vindicates the heathen in paragraph 27, thereby preferring the heathen worship as more pure than ours.

The only topic of his second essay which I have not now disposed

of, is that which he takes up in the second note to paragraph 25, and which he more specially treats of in paragraph 26. In which, his object is to show that we are not misrepresented when it is alleged "that sensible that our practice is contrary to the second commandment; we have in several of our Catechisms omitted the second, and to keep up the number, split the tenth into two." The first fault of your correspondent is, that he begs the question, by assuming that what he calls the second commandment is not a part of the first.

I shall not prolong a contest which has far exceeded in length my original plan, by taking up this question at large. I shall merely remark in the first place, that neither God nor Moses divided the law, containing the precepts, in the one way or in the other, and that if we give the entire of the law itself, as Bishop Stillingfleet attests, or as your correspondent attests—I care not which, (par. 26,) in our Vulgate and Doway Bibles, which are our standards of Latin and English, it cannot be fairly said that we omit that which we actually print. "But we omit it in our Catechisms." Our object could not be to mislead, for if it was, we would act very absurdly by printing it in our Bible. But does your correspondent mean to assert by the words, "and as it is printed in the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and the Doway Bible, and so forth," that these Bibles do divide the law into ten heads, and place this the second? For if he does, he asserts what is not the fact. The Bible has no such division, no Bible ever exhibited the division. In the next place; the division of this law into ten heads was a human institution of convenience, and it would be just as fair for me to state that they are only three commandments, or only two commandments as that they are ten. In the first case, I would divide the law into the precepts regarding the worship of God, the external conduct of man to his neighbour, and the regulation of his own desires. In the second case, I would divide it as our Saviour did, into the duties towards God, and those towards man, and yet having only two or three commandments, I would still omit no part of the law. In the third place. The division which we adopt, was that which was universally adopted and followed by the Christian Church, at and before the beginning of the sixteenth century. Your mode of dividing has been subsequently taken by the gentlemen whom you call Reformers, for the purpose of having the appearance of a plea to convict us of violating a commandment, by giving to a part of the first, a meaning which I have shown it cannot sustain. Fourthly, our Catechisms do not profess to give the words, but the substance of the law, and therefore, as we conceive what you call the first and second to be only one ordinance, commanding the worship of God, which the pagans neglected, and forbidding

idolatry which they practised, we do not make two separate recitals of what we look upon to be only one precept; and yet we are guilty of no omission, because we give all the words of the law in the Bible where we profess to give them. Fifthly, we find a prohibition of impure acts, followed by a prohibition of theft, and as they are sins of various kinds, and separately prohibited, so we follow the same order in the prohibition of desire to act impurely, and desire to act dishonestly, and we look upon the desires of impurity and injustice, to be as distinct in their moral nature, as are the external acts. Sixthly. Whether we be right or wrong in this mode of division, we are not the originators of the division or omission. I need only to take your own evidence or that of your correspondent to acquit us; for he tells us, (note 2, to par. 25), that others had done so before us, both in the Jewish and early Christian churches. Why then make us the criminals if the crime was committed before we were born? We get two reasons from him, and most notable ones they are. First reason, "Their authority was not paramount."

The question is not concerning authority, but concerning fact. The question of fact is, "whether Roman Catholics omitted the second commandment, and split the tenth into two for the purpose of not having it exist as a reproof of their idolatrous practice." Mark the notable answer. Yes they did—because, though the Jews did it innocently before Christianity existed, yet the Roman Catholics, who received those precepts from the Jews as a divine law, were criminal, because the authority of the Jews was not paramount!!! And the early Christians innocently did it, but yet the Roman Catholics are criminal in doing so, and it was the Roman Catholics who alone were guilty of the omission, because the authority of the early Christians was not paramount!!! Who will now dare to say that your correspondent is not pellucid?—I must match paramount if I can. Really, a person who does not after this, clearly see, that the Catholics were the persons who first omitted the second commandment, must be unable to see through a block of granite!

Finding, however, that the proof will by no means sustain, what is the only conclusion that should be established for his purpose, viz.—That this omission was made first by Roman Catholics, he comes upon the principle of *cy pres*, as near the mark as he can, by sustaining his feebleness upon an unfounded and uncharitable allegation. "nor was their purpose sinister." Thus what the Jews and early Christians did without a sinister purpose according to the paragraph, is proof that the Roman Catholics, who afterwards did it, were the only persons guilty of omission!!! Call you this logic? Really, this puts to shame the wolf,

who, when he was obliged to acquit the lamb because of non-age, alleged that his father committed the crime, for which he should suffer; you will not admit that Jews or Christians are to save us, though both have innocently done what you call our crime, but you find that we are too young to be Jews, though we are in truth those same "early Christians," whom you acquit of any sinister intention, though you condemn us for our sinister intention. Pray, will you ask your correspondent to reconcile his acquittal of the Jews and of the early Christians, who divided the law as we do, with his condemnation of us, and with his statement in paragraph 26?

"Now it may be offensive to Roman Catholics, that Protestants should say they make this omission, because they are sensible that it is called for in aid of the authority of their church, in ordering such adorations as they are required to pay to images; and Protestants may possibly err in assigning this motive for the omission; but as they can see no other, and hold the fact of the omission to be indisputable, they surely are not justly censurable, either for the assertion of the fact, or their manner, so reasonable, of accounting for it."

Can he not see another reason, in our following the Jews and the early Christians?

I now ask any candid person, who has had the patience to read my explanations, whether I was justly censurable for stating in my letter to Bishop Bowen, that it was a misrepresentation of our doctrine and practice to assert:

"1. That Roman Catholics pray to angels and saints to save them by their merits, making those angels and saints mediators with Christ, or in his stead.

"2. That Roman Catholics dishonour Christ, our only mediator.

"3. That Roman Catholics give to creatures the worship due to God alone, and are thus guilty of direct idolatry.

"4. That Roman Catholics worship the blessed Virgin mother of our Lord, in such a way as to commit downright idolatry.

"5. That Roman Catholics worship the images or pictures of the Virgin Mary, and of other saints.

"6. That Roman Catholics violate the second of God's commandments without scruple.

"7. That notwithstanding such violation without scruple, Roman Catholics seem to be sensible that their practice is contrary to the said second commandment.

"8. That therefore in several of their catechisms, the Roman Catholics leave out the second commandment, and to make up the number, they split the tenth into two.

"9. That Roman Catholics, in excusing themselves from idolatry

in their image worship, say no more for their exculpation than the heathens said for themselves, and therefore,

"10. That Roman Catholics are equally idolatrous as the heathens are or were."

I now come to this third essay, in your number for March, where he attempts to show that our adoration and praying to the cross is the most gross and intolerable corruption. In paragraph 29, he states this and another question. In paragraph 30, he undertakes to show that it is a fact that we adore the cross, and that we pray to the cross. To prove that we adore it, he quotes Almain. The passage in this writer is exactly such as that in St. Thomas of Aquin, and the answer I make is the same, which is found at the commencement of my seventh letter, to which I refer you. If Bishop Taylor had no better claim to theological knowledge than this would create, he would indeed hold an unenviable place. His second proof is drawn from the Pontifical, respecting the legate's cross. To this I can only answer, that when he vouchsafes to tell me in what part of the Pontifical the passage is found, I probably shall be able to tell him its meaning.—The Pontifical now lies before me; I have spent some hours in looking through it, I have read over carefully every word in any part which the index showed likely to point out a legate or his cross, and all in vain. I can find no such passage as that which is quoted. Is this a forgery of his own, or who is its author? The third passage is from St. Thomas of Aquin. Did your correspondent forget what he wrote in his second essay, paragraph 23, of St. Thomas Aquinas, that he asserted "that to worship the image with any other act than that by which the original was worshipped, would be to worship it on its own account, which is idolatry?" According to him, then, Thomas Aquinas tells us that it would be idolatry to worship it on its own account, and also tells us that we must worship it on its own account, because we place our salvation in it. This, indeed, is one way of making Thomas Aquinas appear ridiculous. But is this mode honest? Let us see. The quotation is substantially correct, so far as it goes, but it is grossly incorrect as a representation of the doctrine of St. Thomas, because it suppressed what is required to give a correct view of his meaning. The passage is found in his *Summa Theol.*, paragraph 3, quæst xxv., article ix. To explain his proposition, he writes as follows:

"*Respondeo dicendum, ut supra dictum est, honor seu reverentia non debetur nisi rationali naturae; unde creaturae insensibili non debetur honor vel reverentia nisi ratione rationalis naturae. Et hoc dupliciter. Uno modo, in quantum repraesentat rationalem naturam; alio modo in quantum ei quocumque modo conjungitur.*"

"I answer, it must be stated, as was previously said, honour or reverence is not due but to a reasonable being, wherefore honour or reverence is not due to an insen-

sible being, except on account of one that is reasonable. And that might be in two ways. In one way, inasmuch as it represents a rational being: in another way, inasmuch as it is in some manner joined with it."

Thus, it is clear that any respect paid to the cross of Christ, is upon his principle, as exhibited throughout this article, and as explained before in my Letter VII, because of its representing Jesus Christ, to whom it is so joined in our memory, that at once, upon seeing it, the mind is carried to the recollection of his sufferings, and to the disposition for adoring him, who by his suffering upon the cross gave us the hope of our salvation. Hence, the address to the cross is, as Bellarmine shows in the quotation in letter vii., made to Jesus Christ crucified, and not to the insensible piece of wood, to which our children are taught in the *Catechism*, as quoted in my former letter, we may by no means pray, any more than to other images or relics, for they have neither life nor sense, nor power to hear or help us. Gentlemen, I might, perhaps, be under a mistake; but the impression on my mind is, whether correct or not, that no man who has the least pretensions to education or common sense, ever seriously believed that we prayed to the crucifix; and hence, the moment I find the assertion made by any person, who has common intellect, and been taught to read, I lose all respect for him as a candid man or a man of religious honesty. If I can avoid speaking upon religious subjects with such a man, I shall never exchange a word with him on a religious topic.

His next argument, if argument I may so call it, is from the *Missal*, where the office of Good Friday "exhibits the adoration of the cross." He partially inserts the note from the translation of the *Missal*, as I have previously given it, which shows that it is Jesus Christ whom we adore, and not the cross itself. And yet he would persuade his readers that we do what we declare we do not. He again has recourse to the unworthy subterfuge of a groundless distinction between those who can and those who cannot distinguish the image from Jesus Christ. And in quoting the note he has again garbled by omitting the word *only*, which would defeat his entire object if inserted. The note says, "Whenever we kneel or prostrate ourselves before a crucifix, it is *Jesus Christ only* whom we adore." The omission of this word did not satisfy him, but after the garbled insertion, he adds: "This note seems to have been suggested by the obvious apprehension that the people thus called on to venerate, would naturally understand the call to mean *come, let us worship.*" I beg leave to inform him that the note was altogether unnecessary for Catholics; and so far as my own individual opinion might be expressed, I would prefer the translation be neither *worship* nor *vene-*

rate, which are both generic, but *adore*, which is special and appropriate. I cannot say why the note was introduced, but I should naturally believe that it was to guard others than Catholics from being misled by writers as dishonest as your correspondent. For Catholics it is totally unnecessary.

This is the sum of his semblance of argument; and I apprehend he has failed to prove that Roman Catholics either adore or pray to the cross, though excited by the image and the ceremony, they adore and pray to Jesus Christ crucified, in whom alone they have hope of salvation.

I shall here add one remark upon his affected pain and regret. I shall merely for a moment use his own principle against himself, and appeal even to him, what would be his estimation of one who would thus assail his church?

"It is most painful to every good man to behold a large and respectable body of our fellow Protestants sunk into idolatry. It is true, they say themselves, that their intention is not idolatrous; and being, as they are, worshippers of the only Jehovah of the Scriptures, we must draw a favourable distinction between them and the heathen, who, though he bows down or kneels down, as they do, to mere inanimate creatures, still is a worshipper of the unknown God, if not of fictitious deities. But, whatever may be the declaration of our brethren of the Episcopalian Church, we cannot leave the word of God, which is our common standard, acknowledged by themselves as paramount. They even acknowledge that God alone is to be worshipped; but this only aggravates their infatuation, and renders them more the objects of our compassion. Prayer and kneeling are the evidences of worship, and yet they kneel before creatures, and this in the most solemn act of their religious worship, and most serious time of prayer. It is true, they tell us, that, although they kneel to the inanimate element, yet it is not the element, but God that they worship; but do they not bow down? Do they not kneel? And they kneel to worship, and before what they call holy, as if it were untrue that God alone is holy; and then is not it making gods for themselves? Strange gods, before which they kneel or bow down, when the commandment is, you shall not bow down!! They even go farther, for they kneel and bow down, and both, before a creature to which they give the appellation holy, though God alone is holy. What is this but to worship that creature as God? It is painful to see the proof in their own books, and in their own practice—in their communion service, where they meet to eat bread and drink wine, they kneel, whereas Christ and his disciples remained seated at table; the

Scripture does not inform us that they worshipped, or kneeled or bowed down; nay, even to guard against the supposition of such worship, it is specially recorded that it was whilst they were at table. Yet, read the rubrics of the Episcopal Prayer-book, and be moved with compassion for this degeneracy of Protestants; of brethren of our Reformation!!!

"'Then shall the priest first receive the communion in both kinds himself, and proceed to deliver the same to the bishops, priests and deacons, in like manner (if any be present,) and after that to the people in order, into their hands, all devoutly kneeling; and when he delivereth the Bread, he shall say,' and so forth.

"It is true, they say, that they only worship God, but do they not kneel down devoutly to that bread? God forbid that we should assert, that there are not amongst them some whose abstraction of enlightened piety does lead to spiritual worship, but for the multitude! The Lord says, "You shall not bow down," the Church says, "You shall devoutly kneel down." We must, painful as it is, say that the idolatry is palpable.

When your correspondent can feel what he ought to think of one who would address your church in such language, he can estimate the feelings entertained regarding himself by, gentlemen,

Your obedient, humble servant, B. C.

LETTER XIII.

In doubtful points betwixt her diff'ring friends,
Where one for substance, one for sign contends,
Their contradicting terms she strives to join;
Sign shall be substance, substance shall be sign.
A real presence all her sons allow,
And yet 'tis flat idolatry to bow,
Because the godhead's there they know not how.
Her novices are taught that bread and wine
Are but the visible and outward sign,
Receiv'd by those who in communion join.
But the inward grace or the thing signified
His blood and body, who to save us died;
The faithful this thing signified receive:
What is 't those faithful then partake or leave?
For what is signified and understood,
Is, by her own confession, flesh and blood.
Then, by the same acknowledgement, we know
They take the sign, and take the substance too.
The literal sense is hard to flesh and blood,
But nonsense never can be understood.

DRYDEN'S *Hind and Panther.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 24, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—Your correspondent undertakes, in the paragraphs 33, 34 and 35 of his third essay for April, to show that we commit idolatry by adoring the Eucharist. Though such be his avowed object, he wanders most egregiously from the subject into one totally distinct, but into which I shall scarcely follow him. He attacks the doctrine of transubstantiation, to show, that in the Eucharist there is only bread and wine; and that, therefore, we adore nothing but those created substances, and, of course, are idolaters. Even if the doctrine of the Catholic Church were proved to be a mistake, his proposition would not necessarily follow as the result, for the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation, which implies the real presence of Christ together with the bread and wine, might yet be true, even if ours were false; and yet, in that case, we would worship Christ, who would be really present. He will not say that such worship would be idolatry, because Christ, and not the bread and wine, would be the object of our adoration. A very large body of Lutheran Protestants still adore Christ present in the Eucharist. Will the gentleman call his fellow Protestants idolaters?

I shall now suppose the Roman Catholics, the whole of the Eastern separatists, and the Lutherans, to be in error; and that the true doctrine, as to the nature of the Eucharist, is held only by the followers of Zuinglius, or the sacramentarians, principally consisting of the Calvinists, Baptists, Church of England, and their several branches and separations—in all probably scarcely approaching, at most, to forty millions. They form not one-sixth of the Christian community; I believe, from close calculation and enumeration, that they are, more properly speaking, less than one-seventh: let us take them at one-sixth. Let us suppose the other five-sixths, who believe the doctrine of the real presence, to be all in perfect error as to the nature of the Eucharist; which would indeed be a very strange supposition! I ask a simple question of any one of those persons, "Pray, to whom, or to what, do you direct your adoration in presence of the sacrament?" Would he not directly say? "To Jesus Christ." I ask him, "Do you intend to worship bread?" He will certainly answer, "No." I state to him your opinion, that he is under a mistake, and that, indeed, Jesus Christ is not there; that the sacrament is nothing but bread; and then ask him, "Will you adore the bread?" He will reply, that the mistake is on your part, for that you ought to know that it is in the power of God to place one substance under the appearance of another, or, if he be a Lutheran, to conceal one substance in another; that God's word is to

us the most ample evidence; that when he says anything has been done by him, it is certainly done; that he declared the body and blood, and so forth, of Christ would be really present in the sacrament at the consecration of the Eucharist; that this has been so consecrated; that, of course, this is the case to which his testimony applies; and that it is very strange on your part to deny his power to assume this appearance, or to deny that, in fact, he does assume it in the case in which he declared it should be done. Thus, he states that he has satisfactory evidence of the presence of Christ; and that his adoration is intended for the Saviour, and only for him, and not for the bread. Now, gentlemen, suppose what he calls reasoning to be only fanaticism; suppose that Christ had said, "This is bread, which shall signify that I died for you, but it is not my body," instead of saying, "This is my body, which is given for you;" it is clear that, on the part of this adorer, there was no intention of idolatry, though there would have been a mistake as to the fact of the presence of him whom he intended to adore. Would that citizen be a traitor, who, honestly mistaking a spy of the enemy for the commanding officer of the army of his state, would sedulously, and respectfully, and affectionately entertain, protect and escort that spy, affording him all the information in his power? Clearly it was patriotism, not treason, that led him to act. Adoration is a mental act; and our intention is to adore Christ the eternal God, and not bread. This would suffice to rescue us from the imputation so thoughtlessly repeated. But as your correspondent has seen proper to accompany the imputation with a variety of other remarks, it might not be amiss to glance at some of them. He says, that Roman Catholics do not deny that they worship the consecrated elements, paragraph 33. He makes the same assertion in paragraph 35, in which he states that, "according to a decree passed on this subject in the 13th session of the Council of Trent, *latria* or divine worship is not denied to be rendered to them," i. e. the elements. It is plain, that, by the word elements, he and his readers understand bread and wine, consecrated it is true, but still naturally and substantially only bread and wine. The decree to which he refers is the following, which declares it to be a departing from the communion of the church; (Sess. xiii. Can. vi):

"*Si quis dixerit, in sancto Eucharistiae Sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei filium non esse cultu latriae, etiam externo adorandum; . . . . et ejus adoratores esse idololatros.*"

"If any one shall say, that Christ the only begotten son of God, is not to be adored, in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, even with the external worship of *latria* . . . . and that His adorers are idolaters."

I had little trouble in examining whether it was his idol Father

Paul that led your curious correspondent into this mishap. I find in two places that it was not. Roman Catholics then do deny that they worship the elements. But how happy a facility has your correspondent here acquired of calling things by their right names? We have *latria,* in this place even under his own hand, "divine worship."

But he says, that "if Protestants find it impossible to be convinced that the sacramental bread and wine even after consecration, are anything else but bread and wine, Roman Catholics must admit that they do not wilfully misrepresent them in saying that they worship bread and wine in the Eucharist," (par. 33.) The same semblance of argument is used in paragraph 35, and because he, a Protestant, says they are bread and wine, this Catholic who adores Christ must be an idolater! ! ! In the first place I must remark, the question was not whether our doctrine was wilfully misrepresented, but whether it was misrepresented. The dragging in therefore the word wilfully is changing the question and giving up the field. Now for his argument, I leave its answer to himself; and when he shall refute the Unitarian, I will answer him. By the by, it is to me one of the most extraordinary spectacles that I have ever witnessed, to see the self-important orthodoxy of one class of Protestants condemning another class for anti-Christian conduct, in merely helping to carry their common principle of Scripture interpretation, to its just and natural extent. It is a melancholy amusement to behold your Church, for instance, turn upon the Roman Catholics and accuse them of tyranny and dictation, because they say, "These texts respecting the Eucharist, have always been thus understood, and it is an unwarrantable act on your part, now to force upon them a meaning different from the faith of all antiquity;" then declare that she will use the liberty of her own judgment, accountable only to God, for its use. And she next turns to the Unitarian, and declares that he acts unwarrantably, and deserts orthodoxy, because he uses the very same "right" as she calls it, respecting texts concerning the nature of Jesus Christ! ! !—But to our point. Does the Unitarian misrepresent you when he says that you pay an idolatrous worship to the creature Jesus Christ? And are you to be fairly chargable with idolatry in your adoration of Christ the only begotten son of God, as long as the Unitarian will continue to declare that he finds it impossible to be convinced of his eternal divinity?—Is his error to make you a criminal? Are you to be made a butt of obloquy and reproach, because the Unitarian is obstinate? Admirable theology!

In his paragraph 33, the philosophical writer gravely informs us that the "matter is determined by the sense of seeing. They see the

bread and wine, and they see the adoration paid to them.''—As he read my letters to Bishop Bowen, I must be satisfied to repeat that I differ very widely from this writer's metaphysics and theology, for the reasons assigned in my eighth letter to that prelate. But as the gentleman probably is anxious for employment, I shall again have recourse to my Unitarian acquaintance, with whom I differ most widely in doctrine, but who appears to me, be it said without offence, to be the most consistent and rational Protestant that I know. I shall then beg of Protestant Catholic to instruct me how to answer himself by refuting the Unitarian who thus applies the principle so very thoughtlessly adopted by a Protestant Episcopalian. ''The whole matter of idolatry is determined by the sense of seeing. No man hath seen the invisible God; Jesus Christ was seen by man, to the sense of sight he was a man, and yet seen in human shape, seen in every way as a man; still we see him adored, by Protestants.'' The same argument is repeated in paragraph 35. What my answer is, may be found in my letter viii. to Bishop Bowen.

Further on, in the same paragraph 33, he states, Catholics say, that Christ ''meant his disciples to believe contrary to the testimony of their senses, that the bread which the Saviour had in his hand was not bread.'' With all due respect for the most sagacious juggler, they say no such thing.—I call juggler, a person who endeavouring to keep the semblance of the same expression, substitutes one having a totally different meaning. Roman Catholics say that Christ had bread at first; that without changing its appearance, he changed its substance, so that bread ceased to be there, but a totally different substance came in its stead, which latter however, retained the appearance of the bread, just as the angel that appeared to Josue had the appearance of a man: now Catholics believing this to have occurred, did not believe that what was under this appearance was bread, but they believed it was not bread, hence they would beg leave to say, they do not assert what your curious correspondent's legerdemain imputes. They do not use the absurd proposition, ''Bread is not bread,'' but the rational one, ''The body of Christ, though having the appearance of bread, is not bread, but is the body of Christ.'' Neither do they believe against the testimony of their senses, for their senses testify only of appearances, and the appearances are exactly as the senses testify them to be. It is a different question, and one for the judgment, and not for the senses, to determine what is the nature of the substance which the appearance covers. The general rule is that we ought to judge it to be bread; but the special testimony of Christ makes this case an exception when he

says, "This is my body." Upon this, two questions only can arise: first, "Did he mean his body in our senses?" We say there is ample and satisfactory evidence that he did; and next, "Is his testimony sufficient ground for our belief against the general rule?"—We are convinced that it is. We are, unfortunately, as blind as our predecessors were to all the absurdities said to flow from this belief. Your curious correspondent has altogether overlooked a material fact that in his assertion that the Sacrament remained bread, he begged the question. He has honoured me, in his note to Essay 2, with being "plausible and subtle;" I should be very ready to return the compliment if in my power. But, alas! I cannot. In paragraph 34, he says upon the same subject, that the Church is not better authority for him than his eyes, as to what he sees. Nothing shall be more willingly conceded by me: therefore the Church cannot testify to him that what he sees to be bread, is not bread. His proposition, I apprehend, must, in order to be philosophically correct, be differently construed. I am not one of those who admit that it is by sight the nature of substance is ascertained: sight will testify only to the appearance; if then his proposition be made, "the Church cannot testify to me that what appears to be bread does not appear to be bread;" I will as readily grant this too. But I will also assert, that the Church has the authority of Christ, in this case, to declare that what appears to be bread is, by the special interference of God, the body of Christ now clothed with that appearance: as she has the same authority to declare that he who appeared to be no more than a dying criminal was the incarnate Son of God.

In paragraph 35, he attempts to draw a distinction between the mystery of the Eucharist and "the Holy Trinity, and other mysterious doctrines of Christianity," upon the principle that "these doctrines relate to the invisible and incomprehensible nature of operations of Deity," and that "the Eucharistic elements are matter of sensible observation and acts." He must excuse me for saying that I do not understand either the ground of his distinction, or the meaning of his last phrase, and I assert plainly that no ground of distinction exists. For even according to the principle of the Protestant Episcopal Church, it will not be denied, that the Deity operates in some invisible and incomprehensible manner, in the Eucharist, and therefore "this doctrine relates to the invisible and incomprehensible operations of Deity." Tillotson's phrase has been before considered in its principle. Our sight does not deceive us, we are certain that the appearances which we see, are there; our sight takes cognizance of nothing more.—Josue's sight did not testify to him that it was the angelic substance which was present,

but what it testified, was truly testified, and Josue was correctly certain that the appearance of a man was there, though in truth he was subsequently certain, that at the time there was not a man present where his appearance was.

In paragraph 33, he tells us that Christ did not, on any occasion, ask the disciples to believe him against the evidence of their senses. I say, nor did he on this occasion; because the exception which he makes, is not against the correct testimony of the senses, but to the conclusion usually drawn from that testimony; and, therefore, he appeals to the testimony, to establish the facts of miraculous occurrence, upon the plea that the disciples are to follow the general rule in all cases, where an exception is not plainly and fully established, as it was by himself in the special case of the Eucharist. When for the hackneyed and often refuted objections of the vine, the shepherd, and the door, he will produce something new, perhaps a new answer will be given; until then, it will suffice for any reasonable man to consider, that there can be no analogy between a professedly parabolic discourse, and the solemn institution of the most important sacrament in religion: that it would be ridiculous to assert, that because Christ spoke figuratively sometimes, his expressions must always be figurative; and that where all the evidence that can be collected, shows the one expression to be a mere figure, and the other to be literally and plainly meant, that we are to reject this evidence, and to say that both are figures. We, besides, do believe Christ to be actually the door, in the very manner in which he plainly says he is. "I am the door: by me, if any man shall enter in, he shall be saved" (*John* x. 9). In like manner, we believe him to be actually "the good shepherd, that giveth his life for his flock" (*Ib.* 11); in the same way, do we believe him to be actually "the vine, of which his disciples are the branches," in the very plain, literal way, in which he uses the words, "as the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me." (*John* xv. 4, 5). Thus we do believe all his words, in the plain import which they carry with them; nor do we make suppositions, as Archbishop Synge does in paragraph 33, to establish new and easy meanings, after "we suppose his meaning to be" what the Archbishop has made it.

I do not question but the meaning which Archbishop Synge "supposes" is "easy and natural," and implies no mystery, and would be very distinct from "that invisible and incomprehensible nature of operations of Deity;" but this is with me a very sufficient reason for its rejection, because all the ancient witnesses declare that the Eucharist was always considered a sublime mystery, wrought after the "invisible and incom-

prehensible nature of operations of Deity." Neither was it so very "conformable to the common way of speaking among the Jews," who "strove among themselves," saying: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" (*John* vi. 52). And even "many therefore of his disciples, when they heard this, said: This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" (*Ib.* 60). As to Elfric's pastoral homily, it would perhaps be well, before you again quote him, to inform us who he was, of what see he was bishop, and what reason you have for knowing that his homily was either his, or an authentic homily of any bishop of the English Church, previous to the days of Henry VIII., because, notwithstanding your reference to Foxe and Collier, there has hitherto hung a most worrying veil of ignorance upon all those very necessary topics. You will do some service, if you clear up "this mystery." I address this to you, gentlemen, because I know not whether the note be yours, or your correspondent's. When this has been done, I shall enter, if you will, into a discussion of the meaning of the homily itself; until then, it would be only waste of time.

In his paragraph 34, your correspondent boldly asserts:

"The evidence of Scripture, however, is by learned and candid Roman Catholics themselves, admitted insufficient for the faith, which the doctrine of transubstantiation implies, if the church does not make this literal interpretation the true one."

To support this allegation, he in a note refers to Bellarmine's *Treatise on the Eucharist*, lib. iii., chapter xxiii. This is, unquestionably, the most unfortunate reference he could have made. Bellarmine, in chapter xix., clearly proves the doctrine from the Scripture, without any reference to the explanation or interpetation of the church; and, after having fully done so, at considerable length, he closes his chapter with this passage:

Adde, quod licet in verbis Domini esset aliqua obscuritas vel ambiguitas, ea tamen sublata est, per multa concilia Catholicae Ecclesiae, et Patrum consensum.

"Add to this, that even though there should be any obscurity or doubt in the words of our Lord, it is nevertheless removed by many councils of the Catholic Church, and the consent of the fathers."

This is not admitting the insufficiency of the scriptural evidence which he has proved to be sufficient: but asserting, that even though it were not as strong as he showed it to be, still the doctrine could be proved as that of the Scripture, from the testimony, that such was always the meaning attached to those passages. In his chapter xx., he adduces the testimony of the fathers; in chapter xxi., he adduces the testimony of councils and writers subsequent to the age of those fathers; in chapter xxii., he shows the doctrine of transubstantiation from special reasoning: then comes chapter xxiii., whose title is *Refel-*

luntur Kemnitii objectiones, "The objections of Kemnitz are refuted." The third of these objections is, that Andradius, Scotus, and Cameracensis, Catholic writers, admit the insufficiency of the evidence of Scripture to support the doctrine. Answering this, Bellarmine writes:

Quod autem ex Andradio et Scoto, atque Cameracensi Kemnitius refert, mala fide, ut ei solemne est, refert.

"But, what Kemnitz quotes from Andradius, Scotus, and Cameracensis, he quotes dishonestly, as is his solemn custom."

He then adduces the passages, and shows that Kemnitz was more than a match for your curious correspondent:

"Thus Kemnitz makes the hypothetical opinion of Andradius absolute, that he might take the occasion of calumniating him; upon this principle, he could say that Christ was a liar, and could prove it, by the testimony of Christ himself. (*John* viii). "If I say that I have not known him, I shall be like to you, a liar."

The only ground which afforded anything like the shadow of support for the assertion, is a passage of an individual, Scotus, upon which Bellarmine, and. as far as I know, all other divines differ from him, in which he says, that he thinks there is not any one passage of Scripture so completely expressive of the doctrine of transubstantiation, as to force (*coget*) the conviction of its truth, without the testimony of the church, that such was always the doctrine derived from Christ, and delivered in the Scripture. This is a very different view from that given by your correspondent. But, even supposing the opinion of Scotus to be correct, it would not tend to support the conclusion sought by a "Protestant Catholic," whose object is to condemn the adoration as idolatry. Let them grant, what is not the fact, that no one text of Scripture evidently proves transubstantiation, still Scotus and the Lutherans say that the real presence is evidently proved by many texts, and Luther declared that he was anxious to deny the doctrine, but the texts were too plain in its support. Hence, under any circumstances, even if we should grant him Scotus, and transform an individual into "learned and candid Roman Catholics," it will not aid his object.

In the same paragraph 34, he asserts, that Protestant writers have abundantly shown from the early fathers, that they held the doctrine of the Eucharist, without that of the real bodily presence. He must not be displeased at my asserting, that no Protestant writer has shown it, though several have attempted it; nor is it true, that it is an historical fact, though endeavoured by various attestations to be established as such, that the real bodily presence of Christ was not asserted until the close of the eighth century, nor that the manner of change in the Eucharist was not accounted an article of faith until the twelfth. He must also permit us to think, that the learned Doctor Wharton has

made a complete failure in his attempt. But I do not undertake to enter upon any controversy upon this point, my object being merely to vindicate myself from the charge of having made an untrue assertion, when, in my letters to Bishop Bowen I stated, that they who exhibited us as idolaters, were guilty of misrepresenting our tenets. Nor is it a fact, that it was Innocent III. in the Council of Lateran, established transubstantiation as to doctrine, though I admit the word was adopted by that Council, as consubstantial respecting the divine nature of Christ, was in the first Council of Nice, but in each case, the doctrine pre-existed to the word: and he only uses against the Catholic in one instance, the argument which he declares in the other to be of no weight, when used by the Unitarian against himself.

In paragraph 37, he makes a strange effort to bring Bossuet to his side, but it is one of those efforts which had better be omitted. Bossuet does not object to the word spiritually so as absolutely to reject it, as describing the eating and drinking of the Eucharist. But why does he not explain to us exactly what was the meaning of the Bishop of Meaux? Upon the question whether the Eucharist contained the body of Christ in its natural state of existence, he says: No, but in a state which is called spiritualized, such a state as it was in after its resurrection and glorification; and if eating the body of Christ spiritually be really eating it in this spiritualized state, the expression is not to be rejected. I apprehend that Bossuet and he will be found to differ very widely in their doctrine upon this head; for your correspondent, in paragraph 33, rejects and appears, with Doctor Jortin, to laugh at this distinction. I have, however, upon this topic, a very serious complaint; for, affecting to give the explanation of some of the members of the Roman Catholic Church, in paragraph 33, he evidently has his eye upon the distinction in my *Letter* VIII., No. 26, to Bishop Bowen, where I state, "we are taught that the body of Christ is in this supernatural state in the Eucharist, not in its natural mode of mortal existence, but in its spiritualized state of immortal existence such as it is after its resurrection." It is plain here, that I treat of the same body, though in two states of existence, mortal and immortal; not of two distinct bodies. When a man's body is joined to the soul, and is living, it is the same body which, separated from the soul, is dead; no person would undertake to say that there are two distinct bodies, but it is the same identical body in two very different states. So the body of Christ, in its mortal and natural state, is the same identical body as in its supernatural or immortal state; the body is the same, though its modes of existence be different. Yet your uncandid correspondent asserts that we mean two distinct bodies,

and then laughs at what he could not answer. Where I used the words, "body of Christ, in this supernatural state," he substitutes the words "supernatural and immortal body," and shortly after adds, "of such a body of Christ we know little from the Scriptures. Of the body in which he suffered, we know him to have met his disciples at the passover," and so forth. From this, it is evident that he endeavours to make us appear to mention two distinct bodies, where we only speak of one body in two different states.

The manner in which Jortin mentions the dispute between the corruptibles and incorruptibles reminds me of the manner in which Gibbon and his fellows mention that between the Homousians and Homoiousians, where he says, the entire dispute was about the letter i; and yet it is the introduction of this letter that makes your church cry out "blasphemy" against the Unitarians. If your laugh at me is good, theirs is equally so at you; no two cases can be more parallel than yours on the Eucharist, and theirs on the divinity of Christ. Yes, good sir, it is the same party in the church, that is, the entire church, and not some of her members, who tell you about, not the supernatural body of Christ, but the body of Christ in its supernatural state in the Eucharist; and it better behoved Jortin and you, as divines, to learn and to state correctly what the question was. If you did, your assertion about the Council of Lateran would go by the board, and this was what you should not consent to.

It might, indeed, be very true, that we know nothing, by inspired information, of the presence of the spiritualized and supernatural body of Christ in the sacrament, if you mean to say that it is a different body from that in which he suffered, for he has not two bodies numerically distinct; but we do know from holy writ, in more places than one, that there were apparently incompatible properties of that body in coexistence: thus, gentlemen, when he used the words quoted, Handle and see that a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see I have, we have equally strong evidence that, both in coming into the room and going out therefrom, that palpable flesh and those palpable bones were carried in a supernatural way, through solid enclosures (*John* xx. 19, 26); because they were in that mode of existence which St. Paul describes, and from admitting which your correspondent makes so miserable an effort to escape, by endeavouring to persuade us that what St. Paul describes as the nature of glorified bodies, is no more than to say, that persons who live according to the maxims of the world, flesh and blood, cannot enter the kingdom of heaven. This is, undoubtedly, very profound theology! ! !

But, at length, your correspondent vouchsafes to understand us, and triumphantly asks, "If it is the supernatural body, as changed by final reception to glory, which is in the bread and wine: then the question occurs, how can this idea accord with the creed of Pius IV.?" and so forth. I do not know. Nor is it necessary for me to answer; because your question ought to be put to a Lutheran, not to a Catholic. We do not say that the body of Christ is in the bread and wine. It is a little strange, that, in every way his propositions are put, he misrepresents our tenets.

Had he asked how the doctrine agreed with the creed of Pius IV., I should have answered, "Exactly." Because the one body of Christ, in its state of spiritualized existence, is truly and substantially present under the appearance of the bread, and this a living body, such as it is after the resurrection, having its blood, and so forth, and united personally with the soul and divinity, really, truly and substantially present, but visible under the appearance of a different substance.

How many misrepresentations of our tenets are in this third essay? Yet we are told that we have no cause to complain.

I remain, gentlemen,

Your obedient, humble servant, B. C.

LETTER XIV.

So have I seen, on some bright summer's day,
A calf of genius, debonair and gay,
Dance on the bank, as if inspired by fame,
Fond of the pretty fellow in the stream.

Young.

Charleston, S. C., Aug. 31, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—Your curious correspondent, in his Essay No. 4, in your May issue, commences with an enumeration, in his first two paragraphs, 38 and 39, of the misrepresentations which he undertakes to prove are not misrepresentations. In this latter paragraph, he takes the liberty of changing the question upon one of the heads, in a way which is anything but correct. It is apparently but a softening of the phrase, yet, in truth, it is a restriction of the extent of his terms, the substitution of *some* for *many*: I pass this over, and come to the defence which he sets up for the misrepresentation.

In paragraph 41, he undertakes to show that our doctrine of pennance is not misrepresented. Before I proceed further, allow me to re-

mind you that the word penance has, in our nomenclature, three distinct significations, easily discernible from each other by the context or mode of its use. First; "the virtue of sufficient repentance." Thus, a person is said to be filled with the spirit of penance. Next; "the sacrament by which the sins committed after baptism are remitted through the merits of Christ." Thus, a person is said to have recourse to the remedy or sacrament of penance. Lastly; "works of satisfaction." Thus, a person is said to have done or performed penance. If your correspondent had the slightest notion of our doctrine, he must have been familiar with this distinction. I must presume that he was.

In the beginning of paragraph 41, he informs us that "contrition, confession, and satisfastion, are equally parts of the sacrament of the penance, and together make the matter of it." Now, the manner in which the crotchets exhibit this passage would lead one to suppose it was a quotation from a decree of the council, when, in truth, it is not, and the very word equally, upon which he subsequently rests chiefly for his conclusion, is not either in the explanatory chapter, or in the decretal canon; and although the three acts are usually required, they are by no means equally essential; because contrition, or the spirit of penance, that is true repentance, is always actually necessary, and so essential, that nothing else can supply its want; actual confession is sometimes impossible, the sincere intention and disposition of satisfaction is always sufficient, and penance scarcely ever is actually performed before or at the administration of the sacrament. Thus, the words which he quotes are not those of the council; and they imply what the council did not require. Again, the words "the thing signified by it," which he gives as a quotation, are not in the chapter, nor in the decree: the words of the council are the following:

Sane vero res, et effectus hujus sacramenti, quantum ad ejus vim et efficaciam pertinet, reconciliatio est cum Deo, and so forth.

"But truly the thing, and the effect of this sacrament, so far as relates to its force and efficacy, is reconciliation to God," and so forth.

The *res*, "thing," is not "the thing signified," but the "thing obtained." Our notions of the nature of a sacrament are very different from those of several of your divines, and their expressions do not convey our doctrines.

"The express language of the second decree of the thirteenth session of the Council of Trent, is precisely of this tenor. It exhibits confession and satisfaction as inseparably allied, in order to that end or effect of penance," and so forth. I am convinced that your correspondent would never expose himself as he does, had he read the decrees

which he affects to quote. Now, neither the second chapter nor the second decree nor the second canon, has one syllable upon the subject, much less of the tenor of the subject here quoted. I have looked into Father Paul, which he stated to be his authority, and I cannot find anything even in that author to justify his expressions.

So far from the council exhibiting confession and satisfaction as inseparably allied, to the effect of penance which is reconciliation to God, it distinctly states in chapter iv. of this session.

Docet praeterea, etsi contritionem hanc aliquando charitatem perfectam esse contingat, hominemque Deo reconciliare, priusquam hoc sacramentum actu suscipiatur; ipsam nihilominus reconciliationem ipsi contritioni, sine sacramenti voto, quod in illa includitur, non esse adscribendam.

"It teaches moreover, that although this contrition might sometimes be perfect charity, and might reconcile a man to God before this sacrament be actually received, nevertheless, the reconciliation itself is not to be ascribed to the contrition itself, without the desire of the sacrament which is included therein."

Thus, so far from being inseparably allied thereto, they are actually separated therefrom, except so far as relates to their desire; and the reconciliation takes place sometimes long before they actually exist. Your correspondent is certainly, no theologian. He handles implements to which he is unused. Even in Father Paul, he might have seen the above statement given almost in the very words of the council.

The council in chapter xiv. of the sixth session declared, as by reference to it you will perceive, that temporal punishment is not *always* remitted, as happens in baptism, and sometimes upon repentance for the sins after baptism; that is, when the sorrow is such, as is here described, contrition produced by perfect charity or the pure love of God; for in those two cases the temporal punishment is altogether remitted by God, together with the guilt and the eternal punishment, at the moment that through the merits of Christ he takes away the guilt. Thus it is not true that confession and satisfaction are inseparably allied, in order to reconciliation with God.

He next makes a Latin quotation from "the same decree" (2d of session xiii) not one word of which is found in the chapter or the decree answering to that reference, nor is such passage found in any place that I know of. Had he inserted one word which he appears to me studiously to have omitted, I would acknowledge that the doctrine was exhibited with substantial correctness; but the introduction of that word would have prevented the conclusion which he aims at drawing. However, he found the same omission in Father Paul, that most accurate historian! As the passage is short, I might as well exhibit this as a specimen of

various readings, and an instance of what a change the omission of one or two words will make.

Father Paul. "Of satisfaction the synod doth declare, That the sin being remitted, the punishment is not pardoned, it not being convenient that he should be so easily received into grace who hath sinned before baptism and after, and be left without a bridle which may draw him from other sins," and so forth.

Protestant Catholic. "*The synod doth finally declare concerning satisfaction,* that sin being pardoned by God, the punishment is not altogether remitted, it not being consistent with divine justice, that they who sin after baptism, should so easily and so soon be received to grace, as those who through ignorance sinned before baptism."

This is the writer who informs us "In stating the language of the decrees of the Council of Trent, Father Paul's history of that council, it is proper to mention, is our authority." The words printed in *italics* in the extract, I have translated from his own Latin quotation. Between those two passages, there is a very serious difference. Father Paul says absolutely, and unrestrictedly, that sin being remitted, the punishment is not pardoned, whereas your correspondent gives us a very different proposition, the punishment is not *altogether* remitted. I shall now make a few extracts of the phrases used by the council, but I cannot discover any passage which leads me to find what part the above were intended to represent, unless it be the following.

"Demum quoad satisfactionem, *quae ex omnibus paenitentiae partibus, quemadmodum a patribus nostris Christiano populo fuit perpetuo tempore commendata, ita una maxime nostra aetate, summo pietatis praetextu, impugnatur ab iis, qui speciem pietatis habent, virtutem autem ejus abnegarunt*: sancta Synodus declarat *falsum omnio esse, et verbo Dei alienum,* culpam a Domino *nunquam* remitti, quin universa etiam pœna condonetur: *perspicua enim et*[69] *illustria in sacris litteris exempla reperiuntur, quibus praeter divinam traditionem hic error quam manifestissime revincitur. Sane et* divinae justitiae ratio exigere *videtur,* ut aliter ab eo in gratiam recipiantur, qui ante baptismum per ignorantiam deliquerint; *aliter vero, qui semel a peccati et daemonis servitude liberati, et accepto Spiritus Sancti dono scienter*[70] *templum Dei violare, et*[71] *Spiritum Sanctum contristare non formidaverint. Et divinam elementiam decet, ne ita nobis absque ulla satisfactione peccata dimittantur, ut, occasione accepta, peccata leviora putantes, velut injurii, et*[72] *contumeliosi Spiritui Sancto, in graviora labamur*[73] *thesaurisantes nobis iram in die irae. Proculdubio enim magnopere a peccato revocant, et quasi fraeno quodam coercent hae satisfactiorae paenae, cautioresque et vigilantiores in futurum paenitentes efficiunt; medentur quoque peccatorum reliquis; et vitiosos habitus, male vivendo comparatos, contrariis virtutum actionibus tollunt,*" and so forth.—*Sessio* xiv. cap. viii.

"At length as regards satisfaction, which of all the parts of penance as delivered at all times to the Christian people by our fathers, is alone chiefly assailed in our age

[69] *Gen.* iii. 16, 17, 18, 19; *Numb.* xii. 10; xx. 12; 2 *Samuel or Kings,* xii. 13, 14.
[70] I *Cor.* iii. 17.
[71] *Eph.* iv. 30.
[72] *Heb.* x. 29.
[73] *Rom.* ii. 5.

under the greatest pretext of piety, by those who have the appearance of piety, and have rejected its virtue; the holy Synod declares, that it is altogether false and foreign to the word of God, that guilt is never remitted by the Lord, unless he also bestows full pardon from every kind of punishment; for there are very clear and illustrious examples found in the sacred Scriptures by which, as well as by divine tradition, this error is most plainly refuted. And truly, the reason of divine justice appears to require, that they who through ignorance sinned before baptism should be received in one manner into grace; but in another manner, they who being once freed from sin, and delivered from the slavery of the devil, and having received the gift of the Holy Ghost, have not dreaded knowingly to violate the temple of God, and to make sad the Holy Ghost. And it is becoming the divine clemency; lest sins should be so forgiven to us without any satisfaction, so that, taking occasion thereof, thinking sins less grievous, as if with injury and contempt of the Holy Ghost, we should fall into more heavy ones, treasuring up for ourselves wrath against the day of wrath. For without doubt those satisfactory works of penance do greatly recall from sin and restrain as with a bridle; and do make penitents more cautious and vigilant in future; they do also remedy the remains of sins; and take away by the performance of the acts of contrary virtues, the habits of vice contracted by living badly,'' and so forth.

The person who has had the patience to compare the Latin given in the essay and its translation with that of the council and its translation, as given here, cannot but observe how grossly defective and how palpably wrong was Father Paul; and though better than this same accurate and honest Father Paul, how defective was your correspondent. Neither of them represents the meaning of the council. I have marked in roman letters the parts of the original which correspond to the garbled extract given by ''Protestant Catholic.'' I shall now lay before you, the exact difference between the several doctrines.

Doctrine of the Council.—When God remits the guilt of sin to the repentant sinner, he always remits the eternal penalty of hell, but does not always remit altogether the temporal punishment due to the offence.

Stated by ''Protestant Catholic.''—When God remits the guilt of sin, he does not remit the punishment, altogether.

Stated by Father Paul.—When God remits the guilt of sin, the punishment is not remitted.

In the view of the council, the sinner, having contracted the guilt of mortal sin, is liable to punishment in hell for eternity, and also to temporal punishment even in this life. Upon repentance, the mercy of God removes, through the merits of Christ, always the guilt of sin, and always the liability to punishment in hell, and sometimes, but not always, the liability to temporal punishment. The council used the two words *non semper*, ''not always,'' of which Protestant Catholic suppresses the *semper*, ''always:'' and it also used the two words *poenam universam*, ''entire punishment,'' meaning temporal and eternal, which

words your correspondent gives, but insists that in all cases the temporal punishment remains due, by suppressing the word *semper*; and Father Paul, by omitting *semper* and *universam*, is still worse. This is abominable dishonesty, yet effected merely by suppressing two words. Gentlemen, it is such conduct as this, so palpably exhibited as we unfortunately find it generally to be, which caused the Reverend Doctor Whitaker, Protestant Vicar of Blackburn, in England, in his Vindication of Mary (vol. iii., p. 2,) to write: "Forgery—I blush for the honour of Protestantism while I write it—seems to have been peculiar to the reformed . . . I look in vain for one of those accursed outrages of imposition amongst the disciples of Popery."

In this same forty-first paragraph, your correspondent again untruly asserts: "the temporal penalty inflicted by the church as the satisfaction, which is an essential part of the sacrament of penance, remains to be undergone."

Now, it is a proposition which is fully and plainly taught by the council: That the sinner who, having received from God the divine gift of perfect charity, and dying in this disposition of true and perfect contrition, should have desired the sacrament of penance, without having been able to obtain it, and without having been able to any satisfactory work of penance, will, through the merits of Jesus Christ, be reconciled to God, and will enter the kingdom of heaven without suffering any pain of purgatory, and thus, even though he had not received absolution, he would be saved, both from hell and from purgatory. Such is the doctrine of the Council of Trent, in the sixth and fourteenth sessions. As my object is not to enter into a theological defence of our doctrines, but to exhibit the misrepresentations of "Protestant Catholic," I merely refer him to the places where the doctrine is found. So far from its being true that the sinner must suffer in both worlds, this man would not suffer in either, which contradicts his assertions.

In this same paragraph he states that his conclusion will hold good that the temporal punishment must be indispensably undergone by every sinner, unless an indulgence be interposed. Here are two egregious blunders; because, in the first place, where the temporal as well as the eternal punishment is remitted, as in the case of the contrition above described by the council, the remission is not by the interposition of an indulgence; and secondly, the penance imposed in the sacrament of penance is not remitted nor diminished by the interposition of an indulgence. It is very troublesome to have to do with a man who is ignorant of his subject.

Equally untrue is his assertion in the same paragraph, that we

"consider some temporal punishment to await the sinner in purgatory, by way of satisfaction for his sins." If, as it is plain he and the compiler of the *Catechism* did mean, it is meant to assert that every sinner who is saved must, previously to entering heaven, pass through purgatory, we hold no such doctrine. We believe that several of the saints now in heaven never were in purgatory. Even your curious correspondent feels that this assertion of his was not true; for he immediately adds: "Protestants may, perhaps, err in saying that every sinner, in order to make satisfaction to God for his sins, must suffer some temporal punishment in purgatory." Yet he did say it, and reasoned upon the supposition of its truth; and when I denied that we held any such doctrine, he stated that I was deceiving my readers, and he undertook to show that I was not warranted in making the denial. But the next blunder which he makes is so glaring that I can scarcely believe he did not write the nonsense, in order to try and create a feeling of ridicule against us. "Sinners only whose offences are venial, may, perhaps, by the Romanist doctrine of purgatory, be doomed to its torments; whilst those whose sins are mortal may be thoroughly absolved and pardoned before they die." Thus he would exhibit us as believing that the greater sinner suffers less, and the lesser sinner suffers more! ! !—If he thought this was our doctrine, he is extremely ignorant as a divine; if he knew our doctrine, he is criminally dishonest. Which he is, I cannot say.

As some well disposed Protestant might read this, I shall more explicitly state our doctrine; and his gross inaccuracy will be seen, and his many blunders will be easily counted up.

We believe, 1. That sin is a violation of God's law. 2. The sinner becomes guilty upon its violation. 3. The consequence of guilt is penalty. 4. A serious violation is called mortal sin. 5. A slight violation is called venial sin. 6. Persons guilty of mortal sin are liable to eternal punishment in hell. 7. Persons guilty of venial sin are liable to temporal punishment. 8. No person can enter heaven with the stain of guilt upon him. 9. The guilt is removed only by the mercy of God, upon the application of the merits of Christ, after the repentance of the sinner. 10. When God remits the guilt of the punishment, he does not always remit all the temporal punishment, though he always remits the eternal punishment. 11. Persons who have true contrition, arising from perfect charity, have the guilt and the eternal and temporal punishment wholly and fully remitted, and without any application of an indulgence. 12. The temporal punishment might, through the merits of Christ and the mercy of God, be removed by satisfactory works of penance, performed in this life by the repentant sinner, who has ob-

tained pardon of guilt and remission of eternal punishment. 13. Should he die before he has fully suffered what God had allotted, or been able to obtain its remission, he will suffer the unremitted or unsatisfied part in purgatory; after which, being free from guilt, and not liable to punishment of any description, he will, through the mercy of God and the merits of Christ, enter heaven. 14. Because of their being in our communion, and their being free from guilt, and in regard to the merits of the Saviour, of which they are partakers, and by which our prayers are enriched, God will alleviate the sufferings of those who may be detained in purgatory, upon the prayers of those who with proper dispositions intercede for them.

Such is our doctrine, which your correspondent has grossly misrepresented; whether wilfully or not matters nothing to us, but much to him. As to the suffeing being by fire or not, we have no certain knowledge of faith, neither are we bound to believe without stronger evidence than we possess, that such is the mode of suffering; but such is the general opinion of the western division of the Roman Catholic Church. Others, fully in our communion, are of the opinion that the suffering is by darkness: in the estimation of each, this is a topic of opinion, not of faith. A Roman Catholic is bound only to believe "that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful."

The forty-second and forty-third paragraphs, as they relate to penance, are but unbecoming rant and illogical inference. In the forty-second your correspondent states, that in ours, as in every other human society, there are hypocrites, fools, and knaves; and that abuses of which some of our own good members complain, have been introduced and are continued by such persons, under the alleged warrant of the church's teaching, and the Pope's permitting. Is, then, the allegation of a knave, of a fool, or of a hypocrite, the evidence upon which a church of nearly two hundred millions of Christians is to be condemned as holding doctrine which she disavows, and which her upright and intelligent members "indignantly disclaim," to use his own expressions? Gentlemen, is your case so desperate as to require your retreat to this disgraceful citadel? Is this the accurate reasoning—this the high-minded honour—this the generous liberality—this the dignified demeanour of members of the Protestant Episcopal Church?—I would say, it is impossible, but that it is a fact! ! !

Of all the miserable shifts of a disappointed sophister, that which is least honourable is, after avowing that "many virtuous and enlightened Roman Catholics, especially in England and the United States, in-

dignantly refuse to recognise in them (the imputed doctrines and practices) anything belonging to their system of institutions;" still, with the knowledge that their doctrine is the same as that of every other Catholic in the world; to assert without evidence, that those doctrines are held elsewhere, and to assert against evidence that they are those of the Roman Catholic Church. Yet such is the conduct of your correspondent. He makes groundless assertions of "pious, faithful, and pure" priests now to be found, deploring the fact of such abuses. Why not name those pious and good men? I must avow, that to me this is news indeed. I know of no such fact as he states: yet he assertts that they may be everywhere found. Can he name one person, or one place? I willingly admit that he might find in many places, pious and faithful priests deprecating the evil and shame of such misconduct as his, the unfounded imputation of such doctrines to our Church!

As to the testimony of Protestants who have visited Catholic countries, and which he refers to, I shall probably in my next letter examine the value of the special instances which he adduces, and it is only from the nature of the special testimony a correct general result can be drawn. I shall, however, here make one general remark founded upon my own personal knowledge. Others might have been more fortunate in their aequaintances than I have been; though perhaps, not many have had much more extensive opportunity. I have known some of the best-informed and most liberal Protestants, men who would have done honour to any circle of society, and many of whom have been conspicious in public and private life, who have visited Catholic countries. Several have had prejudiees removed, many have had them extended and confirmed, and others had them scarcely in any respect modified. But of the entire number, I cannot now bring to my recollection a single individual who was fitted to give testimony to others, or to form a correct judgment himself, respecting the ceremonial or practices which came under his observation. This will, to several of my readers, appear strange: but the explanation is simple. Not one of them had previously acquired the necessary information: not one of them knew the principles, the doctrines, or the history of the Church: so far from having the proper information, they had previously misinformed themselves, by reading such works as your writers produce. As well might you expect a correct judgment of our conduct, character and institutions, from an English traveller who had prepared for a visit to these States by reading as a correct and accurate statement Paulding's *John Bull in America,* and then, with a firm belief in its truth, was driven through our States on a tour of observation. I would just as soon expect a Kal-

mue Tartar to comprehend the process of carrying a bill through Congress, or of conducting a suit through our courts, or to comprehend the purport of our festive national celebrations, as to find a well-disposed and well-informed Protestant, who has only the notions which you and yours generally give of our religion, comprehend a single religious celebration of the Catholic Church. I never had to exercise more self-restraint, than when listening to the incongruous remarks of some of my most kind and respectable friends, who imagined they displayed knowledge and liberality.

What in the name of common sense, can be more ridiculous than for one of those lordlings (Mounteashel I believe) gravely to state, as your correspondent relates, that "Popery was little understood in England," where the premier-earl-marshal, and a number of the aristocracy, and nearly a million of the people were Roman Catholics? It is true the Protestants did not then know as well as they do now, what that religion is. But was it not more ridiculous for this same nobleman to inform the people of Ireland as he did, that they did not know their own religion as well as he did? He said that he learned it in Spain, Yet the four archbishops of Ireland and two or three of her bishops, at that very period, were prelates who had learned and taught theology in Spain! and your curious correspondent has the assurance to tell us that we in America understand very little about our religion. I suppose he means as it exists in the Catholic nations of Europe, though our prelates and clergy and laity, are not only composed of native Americans North and South, but of citizens adopted from Ireland, from England, from France, from Spain, from Italy, from Portugal, from Germany, from Holland, and so forth. He, who, for aught I know, was never in any one of those countries, vouchsafes to inform us who have come from the very spot, that he knows our religion in that place better than we do! This is a degree of modesty to which we do not aspire.

Will your correspondent then account for this extraordinary fact. That there is scarcely a Catholic congregation in the United States in which you will not find blended together, the natives of five or six foreign nations, severed not only by seas and mountains, but by language and customs, and yet they are all found most harmoniously to agree in doctrine and practice!—This is an exhibition which is peculiar to "the Church of all nations;" when he can give me a parallel fact in his society, I shall cease to be amused at his foolish usurpation of the name of "Catholic."

One other remark is perhaps called for by the note to paragraph

42, by Mendham. We desire to be judged by the decisions of the Council of Trent, why do our adversaries fly from its application?—The miserable sophistry, that individuals cannot disclaim, because individuals cannot decide, is too puerile. Though an individual cannot pass an act of Congress, yet he can testify that such an act has been passed; or where he hears it falsely asserted that such a law exists, he can testify that it does not, though he could neither enact nor repeal nor modify it. Our church decides, and we know and can apply its decisions.

In paragraph 43, the writer, who, in the preceding one had the indelicacy to charge us without evidence, and against evidence, with *priest-craft* and *holy immorality*, now avows that what he charges "is not our doctrine and practice as required by the highest authority of our church to be taught and inculcated, *nor* as they are *everywhere* taught and inculcated;" now his note-writer, Mendham, stated that it was to this faith and discipline one ought to look for the "true and genuine character" of the Roman sect. Thus, your correspondent avoids the very mode which his own associate whom he quotes with approbation, points out. And what mode does he follow? He looks to "what is known and observed to be in some portion of the Roman Catholic communion," and to what might be "anywhere within its limits." That is, as he told us before, "There might be hypocrites and knaves and fools anywhere in your church, and in fact there are some in various portions of it. But your governing authority everywhere teaches and inculcates, and good members adhere to doctrines and practices, opposed to the conduct of those fools and knaves; but you must have the character of your church depicted from the misconduct of the fools and knaves, and not from the uniform teaching of your tribunal."—Such is the avowed principle on which we are calumniated, such the mode in which we are represented! And you do not blush and hide your heads in shame at the avowal!!! There is a point in misconduct at which shame and honour cease to be found! It is not for me to apply the observation.

As to his queries, I for one will pretend to say that the correction of the sinner is attained by the means of the sacrament of penance. I also again charge your correspondent with gross misrepresentation by introducing the word adequate before "satisfaction," because no Roman Catholic asserts that the satisfaction made by the sinner is adequate. He would condemn as heretical the assertion which is here attributed to himself. The adequate satisfaction is made only by Christ. I also assert, that in no country does the Roman Catholic Church permit, nor could she permit the medicinal penance, or medicinal satisfaction imposed in the sacrament of penance by the priest upon the penitent to be

performed by another, and I lay claim to some information and to some candour.

When he undertook to correct my statements, he ought to have been prepared with testimony instead of useless questions and vapid declamation.

I remain, gentlemen,
Your obedient, humble servant,

B. C.

LETTER XV.

And were they vain, those soothing lays ye sung?
Children of Fancy! Yes, your song was vain:
On each soft air though rapt attention hung,
And silence listened on the sleeping plain.

The strains yet vibrate on my ravished ear,
And still to smile the mimic beauties seem,
Though now the visionary scenes appear
Like the faint traces of a vanished dream.

Langhorne.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 7, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—It was very kind in your correspondent to warn us to be discreet. We do not every day meet with so generous an opponent. Others, less charitable than he is, would have encouraged us to do those deeds of indiscretion which would tend to their advantage; but "Protestant Catholic,"!! already more than triumphant, scorns to stoop so low. He discovers our weak point and magnanimously cautions us not to expose it. "On the subject of indulgences, it is indiscreet in Catholics to say much." I shall take his advice and write but little. However, I shall vie with him in generosity, by candidly avowing the reason. To write much is not necessary for my purpose. My object is only to prove that in my letters to Bishop Bowen, I did not hazard a statement which I could not support. I stated that it was a misrepresentation of Roman Catholic doctrine and practice to assert either of the following propositions.

"That the Pope grants indulgences whereby he sometimes remits all penances of such sins as shall be committed for a great number of years to come.

"That the Pope grants indulgences whereby he sometimes remits all penances of such sins as shall be committed during a man's whole life.

"That those indulgences are considered by many Roman Catholics as licenses to commit sin.

"That the public sale of those licenses to commit sin, is practised by the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, or of the Pope."

He makes scarcely an effort to prove the truth of one of the propositions. He merely declaims.

He states that "It (the subject of indulgences) is too plain and universally known an instance of the corruption of the Church." But this assertion is not disproving the truth of any one of my propositions. He says: "which (corruption) even the Council of Trent left very imperfectly remedied." The doctrine of indulgences and the abuse of indulgences are two very different subjects: as different as the use of medicine and its abuse; the use of meat and drink is not their abuse. Your correspondent does not vouchsafe to inform us whether he looks upon an indulgence to be in any way useful or available, and if he does, to what extent. I shall exhibit what the church usually teaches her children upon the subject.

"Q. Can we cancel our sins by our own satisfactory works?

A. No; our sins can be cancelled only by the merits of Jesus Christ.

Q. What do you mean, then, by saying that penance is a satisfaction for sin?

A. I mean, that when by the merits of Christ, the guilt of sin and its consequences, damnation, are remitted, a temporal punishment remains due, of which we may procure remission, by penitential works, which also have their value from the merits of our Redeemer.

Q. Will the penance enjoined in the confession, always satisfy for our sins?

A. No; but whatever else is wanting may be supplied by indulgences, and our own penitential endeavours.

Q. What does the church teach concerning indulgences?

A. That Christ gave power to the church, to grant indulgences; and that they are most useful to Christian people. (*Conc. Trid.* xi. 25.)

Q. What is the use of an indulgence?

A. It releases from canonical penances, enjoined by the church on penitents for certain sins.

Q. Has an indulgence any other effect?

A. It also remits the temporary punishments, with which God often visits our sins; and which must be suffered in this life, or in the next unless cancelled by indulgences, by acts of penance, or other good works.

Q. Has the church power to grant such indulgences?

A. Yes; Whatsoever, says Christ to St. Peter, thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven. (*Matt.* xvi. 19; *II Cor.* ii. 10).

Q. To whom does the church grant indulgences?

A. To such only as are in the state of grace, and are sincerely desirous to amend their lives, and to satisfy God's justice by penitential works.

Q. Is an indulgence a pardon for sins to come, or a license to commit sin?

A. No; nor can it remit past sins, for sin must be remitted by penance as to the guilt of it, and as the eternal punishment due to mortal sin, before an indulgence can be gained.

Q. Why does the church grant indulgences?

A. To assist our weakness; and to supply our insufficiency in satisfying the Divine Justice for our transgressions.

Q. When the church grants indulgences, what does it offer to God to supply our weakness and insufficiency, and in satisfaction for our sins?

A. The merits of Christ, which are infinite and superabundant, together with the virtues and good works of his Virgin Mother, and of all his saints.

Q. What conditions are generally necessary to gain indulgences?

A. A good confession and communion, and a faithful compliance with the other good works which the church requires on such occasions.

Q. What are the other good works which the church usually prescribes, in order to gain indulgences?

A. Prayer, fasting, and alms deeds; which good works, besides confession and communion, are recommended by indulgences; and on this account also, they are most useful to Christian people."—*Catechism*, Lesson xxx.

Now, the Council of Trent did not decide, as perhaps, he would wish, that an indulgence was a corruption, or a superstition; but as there did exist several abuses, it applied a remedy in the following decrees: In the twenty-first session, held on the 16th of July, 1562, chapter ix., "On Reformation," after adverting to the decrees of the Councils of Lateran, of Lyons, and of Vienne, having applied remedies "against the wicked abuses of quests," and complaining of the inefficacy of those remedies, and the scandals which those continued abuses perpetuated, "totally abolished their use and name throughout Christendom:" after having then commanded that they should under no colour be permitted, it proceeds to regulate that the indulgences or spiritual benefits, shall be published by the ordinaries accompanied by two members of the Chapter, and forbids any renumeration to be given or received for the publication: but any alms which might be bestowed, are

to be fully and faithfully applied to pious uses, so that no profit or gain shall arise from the practice of piety. In the twenty-fifth session, celebrated on the 4th of December, 1563, it was decreed, after stating that the power had been left by Christ in the church, and was used from the most ancient times, to the benefit of the Christian people, and condemning all who contradict this: "But in granting those, it desires that moderation be had according to the custom of old, and approved in the Church, lest by too great a facility, ecclesiastical discipline should be enervated. But desiring the correction of the abuses which have crept into them, and by occasion of which, this remarkable name of indulgences is blasphemed by heretics, should be amended and corrected, it generally enacts by the present decree: that all wicked gain for obtaining them, whence great cause of abuses flowed upon the Christian people, should be altogether taken away. But as to the other evils, which have in any way arisen by reason of superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or otherwise in any way whatsoever: since because of the many corrupt practices of different places in which they are committed, they cannot be all specially prohibited; it commands all bishops, that each should diligently seek out the abuses in his own diocess, collect them, and relate them in the first provincial synod, so that the opinion of other bishops being known, they may be immediately referred to the Pope, by whose authority and prudence, that might be enacted which would be expedient for the Universal Church: so that the grace of holy indulgences, might be dispensed to all the faithful, in a pious, holy, and uncorrupted manner."

Thus has the Council regulated, and thus has the Church executed.

As regards Mosheim. I not only dispute but deny his authority, and distinctly aver that his statements are not correct. In describing the treasure he omits that which is its chief ingredient, viz., "the superabundance of the merits of Christ." Such is but a specimen of his dishonesty.

Your correspondent makes a serious mistake if he imagines that I shall dissent from one syllable which "the amiable and ingenuous Fleury" has written in his fourth discourse upon the subject of indulgences. I subscribe to the entire. I only regret that you published an unfair and a garbled extract. Allow me to make a few remarks.

"Indulgences" form the sixteenth topic of the historian's fourth discourse, and this very naturally followed the fifteenth which related to "the change of Penance," where "the amiable and ingenuous Fleury" pathetically laments the abolition of public and of severe works of satisfaction, against which your curious correspondent lamentably

declaimed; so that here Fleury and he were fully opposed. Although it is a pretty long discussion, still I shall give the translation of a portion to show what Fleury thought of indulgences, and to exhibit that his meaning is misrepresented by the garbled extract which you have published as a specimen of his sentiments.

"It is true that the multitude of indulgences, and the facility of *gaining* (granting) them, were a great obstacle to the zeal of the more enlightened confessors. It was hard to persuade to fasting and discipline a sinner, who could *redeem them* (buy it off) by a small alms, or by a visit to a church. For the bishops of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries granted indulgences for all sorts of pious works."

Here your correspondent stops, as usual, at a comma, in an unfinished sentence. I have marked in *italics*, where my translation of the word *gagner*, corrects his *granting*; and mine for *les racheter*, corrects his *buy it off*. But I suspect the object of his stopping was to leave the impression on the reader's mind that the money paid in the buying off went into the pocket of him who granted: why else did he not continue the sentence which proceeds?—

"Such as the building of a church, the endowment of an hospital, in fine every description of public work, a bridge, a causeway, the paving of a high road. The indulgences, in truth, were nothing more than a part of the penance; but if many of them were united, the entire could be redeemed. These are the indulgences which the fourth Council of Lateran calls indiscreet and superfluous, which bring the keys of the church into contempt, and enervate the satisfaction of penance. To prevent the abuse, it ordains that for the dedication of a church, the indulgence shall not exceed one year, even though many bishops should be present, for each used to undertake to give his own."

I apprehend this gives a different sort of view from what your curious correspondent intended, and it is neither "amiable" nor "ingenuous" to garble. The church then does not recommend, nor approve, nor sanction even such disproportionate indulgences, but calls them abuses. But the writer generally condemns the church for what she herself condemns, and imputes to her what she disclaims, and makes her own writers appear to testify against her, by garbling their works. It is also clear that the money did not go to the person granting the indulgence, but for the public good. I apprehend, however, that such indulgences would neither spoil our roads, nor destroy our bridges, nor starve our poor, nor increase our taxes.

Fleury then adduces the reasoning of William, Bishop of Paris, in vindication of the practice of the indulgence, being more to the honour of God, the public benefit, and the salvation of souls than the infliction of heavy satisfaction of penance. Fleury, whilst he upholds the doctrine of the church on each point, differs in his view of expediency from the bishop, and after a considerable discussion adduces the

example in the essay, the whole of which, however, your correspondent does not give, and after the phrase "The application is easy (obvious)"; he then makes that application in the following manner.

"We must then go back to the maxim of St. Paul, that everything which is permitted is not expedient. Because this prince who would pardon the guilty would only do as he had a right to do, for I suppose him a sovereign; but he would use his right indiscreetly. So with indulgences. No Catholic doubts but that the Church can grant them: nor that she ought to do in certain cases, what she has always done: but it is the duty of her ministers to dispense these favours with wisdom, and not to create a useless profusion, or perhaps a pernicious one."

Your notably candid correspondent, however, instead of giving us Fleury's explanation and application, flies off from his fourth discourse which he quotes, and adds a passage of his sixth, which is also distorted by its unnatural juxtaposition with what the author never intended to place it near. In his sixth discourse he treats of the Crusade, which your correspondent calls by some very ugly names, concerning the propriety of which I shall not now dispute. Another time perhaps, and a more fit occasion, might induce me to give my reasons for differing very widely with him upon this subject. But even this passage he garbled also. Fleury begins his paragraph by stating that it was not Pope Urban alone, but the council of two hundred bishops assembled at Clermont, that for reasons previously assigned, looked upon it as the will of God that the expedition should be undertaken, and then continues:

"To carry it into execution, and to put the people in motion, the great resource was a plenary indulgence; and it was then that this commenced. At all times, the church had left to the discretion of the bishops, to remit some part of the canonical penance, according to the fervour of the penitent, and other circumstances; but until now it had not been seen, that in favour of one single work the sinner was discharged from all the temporal punishment for which he might be amenable to the justice of God. It required no less than a numerous council, at which the Pope presided in person to authorize such a change in the usage of penance; and doubtless it is believed that there existed good reasons for it. For more than two hundred years, the bishops had found it very difficult to bring sinners to submit to the canonical penances: it had been even made impracticable by multiplying them according to the number of sins, whence arose the invention of commuting them, so as to redeem entire (buy off many) years, in a few days. Because amongst the commutations of penance, for a long time were used, pilgrimages to Rome, to Compostella, or to Jerusalem; and the Crusade added to these the perils of war. Persons, upon this ground, believed that this penance was equivalent to the fasting, the prayers, and the alms which each penitent might in particular offer, and that it would be more useful to the church, without being less agreeable to God."

Such is Fleury's paragraph in which he does not assert that it was then for the first time a plenary indulgence was given; but that then was the first time that it was granted for the performance of one single work. In his fourth discourse he had, as we see, stated, that "if many

[works] were united, the entire [canonical penance] could be redeemed." And in the very earliest ages, instances are found of the full remission. Fleury states also the remedies applied not only by the Council of Trent, but also by previous councils, and mentions them with approbation.

Your correspondent then, instead of taking up either of the propositions which he undertook to confute, has garbled Fleury, quoted Mosheim, and concluded with a notorious falsehood, "That indulgences are still to be had in the Roman Catholic Church under the authority and at the discretion, in general of the Pope for money applicable to the usages of the Church."

It is no argument, it is no proof, to write, "Will any pretend to question this?" when we not only question but deny its truth. "Can it be unknown to any?" is no proof, when it is denied that it is known to any. I do as firmly and as determinedly and as plainly, deny that at the present day "indulgences are to be had in the Roman Catholic Church for money applicable to the uses of the Church," as I assert that I have proved your correspondent to be guilty of garbling, misrepresentation, and dishonesty. I am aware that the assertion is made: but to make an assertion is not to prove its truth. I have the authority of the Bishop of Charleston to make the following statements upon his responsibility for their truth. That he has received from very highly respectable witnesses, the names of some persons belonging to ancient and wealthy families in this state, who solemnly declared upon their honour that they read upon the doors of the cathedral notices from him of the sale of indulgences; and yet that he never did give any such notice, and that no publication had even to his knowledge or suspicion been ever so exhibited as to give any pretext for such a charge upon him. Number 236 of the *Miscellany,* published on the 5th of July, 1828, contains some documents regarding one of those calumnies. Look to that, and say what remedy could be applied if the person who was capable of publishing this of the Church of Charleston, should, after returning from a European tour, report the occurrence of a church in Italy?

The Bishop also authorizes me to state that the indulgence mentioned in paragraph 46, is one of which he has full and intimate knowledge. He was at the period alluded to, Secretary to the Diocess of Cork, and the present Bishop of Cork was then its Archdeacon; the execution was committed to the archdeacon, and secretary, by the then Bishop of Cork. The pastoral letter was drafted by the secretary, and all the details of the exercises were superintended by him, and not one cent of money was looked for, upon any pretext whatever, save the usual collections applicable to the usual purposes, except one extra collection

which he made by his own authority, to relieve the family of a poor man who was crushed to death in the crowd, leaving his family, consisting of a wife and seven children, totally destitute. But so far as the spiritual benefits of the indulgence exhibited themselves in fervent and renewed piety, in the restitution of property dishonestly acquired, in the oblivion of ancient and inveterate enmities, in the sedulous attention to prayer and instruction, he never did, and probably never will, witness a more gratifying and edifying scene than continued at that time, during four successive weeks. Nor was there found in the city, as far as he could discover, a single Protestant who did not proclaim, that if the Catholic religion always exhibited itself in such a manner, no one could resist its influence. Such, gentlemen, is the testimony of Dr. England. Upon what then does your correspondent found his assertion, that indulgences might now be had for money?

In paragraph 44, your correspondent introduces, "in relation to the prayers for the dead in purgatory as well as indulgences," a passage from Daubney's *Protestant Companion.* But "the respectable author of our own times," has really made a very curious exhibition of himself. Were I not to know from other sources the meaning of the notice which he saw, and attempts to translate, I could never make out from his exhibition what it meant: for the translator not knowing the language of the country, or phraseology, or facts, or doctrine of our church, made perfect nonsense of the entire. There is no such phrase as "receiving the prayers of a mass," intelligible amongst us: and you may go through half Christendom asking how a man "could receive two Cantatas," or "the prayers of two Cantatas," before you could get any Catholic to suspect what you meant, or to look upon you to be in your sound senses.

The entire notice in plain English amounts to nothing more than the following. That this was not a public church of a parish, but one maintained by a private subscription, the clergy who officiated in which were supported out of the contributions of the benefactors: and that the sum required for such support, was regulated at certain rates for the various duties, so that persons desirous of having the benefit of the services therein performed, must contribute accordingly, either monthly, or as life members, and that the benefactors would also be specially prayed for and remembered in the services after their death, with a recommendation to persons rather to join the society of that church, than to depend upon the casual affection of surviving relations.

Paragraph 45 regards an indulgence, but for what? For money? No. For repentance for sins, confessing, going to communion, and pray-

ing—Yes, such is our doctrine, that in consideration of those acts of virtue, God will, through the merits of Jesus Christ, not only remove the guilt, and the eternal punishment, but also the temporal punishment which might remain due to the repentant sinner. But the nonsense of the translation in the previous paragraph is really common sense when compared to the multiplied blunders of this. Surely it was not Barretti that taught "this respectable author of our own times" to translate *Quarante* "forty-eight." I profess myself completely unable even to guess at what is meant by "his professed confession being confirmed." I know the foundation of the ridiculous blunder of "acquire ten years," but the superlative ignorance of the "respectable author of our own times," who gives "moreover forty indulgences for each time," would be really capping the climax, but that "the *Breviary of Paul the Fifth*" places a pinnacle even above the cap. Do,—good gentlemen, for mercy sake, tell your correspondents to take up our American prayer-books, and save our country at least, the disgrace of those exhibitions of the lowest ignorance. Those expressions are downright nonsense: you can if you will, find in several of our churches in Maryland and Kentucky, I believe also in Louisiana and Missouri, that this "devotion of the forty hours" is practised and understood as well as it is in Rome. We will ourselves give you our books and explain our doctrine and practices, upon your application, and then when you assail us, you will do so without making yourselves ridiculous.

In paragraph 47, your correspondent founds his conclusion upon a false assumption, that "the confessing penitent may buy himself off from the necessity of that which is imposed to satisfy the divine justice," hence the conclusion that "it operates as a license to commit sin," is not true. But surely "the gratuitous discharge" will so operate. Be it so, good gentlemen! What then shall we say to you who have granted a total and a gratuitous discharge? You say that Jesus Christ has granted to the repentant sinner, a total and gratuitous discharge for all satisfaction to the divine justice. We say he does not always grant a total discharge, but that generally he substitutes a temporal for the eternal punishment, and that sometimes, he afterwards, in consideration of some acts of virtue, remits the temporal punishment also. Which is more like "a license to commit sin?"

Recollect, gentlemen, that not even an attempt was made to prove a single allegation of mine respecting indulgences to be incorrect. The whole of your charges are day-dreams of fancy.

I remain, gentlemen,

Your obedient, humble servant, B. C.

LETTER XVI.

So saying, with extended wings,
Lightly upon the wave she springs;
Her wisdom swells, she spreads her plumes,
And the swan's stately crest assumes.
Contempt and mockery ensued,
And bursts of laughter shook the flood.

MOORE'S *Fables.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 14, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—I am now arrived at the fifth essay in your number for June. The object of your curious correspondent was stated by him not to be controversy, but to show that what I called misrepresentations were not so. In this essay as in the previous one, he seems altogether to lose sight of his professed purpose, for he is quite controversial, and somewhat facetious. His wit sparkles in his forty-ninth paragraph; and the exhibition has been so rarely and so modestly made that it would be cruel to sport with it. Should I tell him that the passage, which at the close of that paragraph he quotes from Bellarmine, *Praef. de Rom. Pont.*, is not a translation of Bellarmine's words, though crotcheted as such, the glittering arrows of his satire would dazzle the beholders and terrify me his unfortunate victim; yet it is true that Bellarmine's words are not accurately represented in the translation.

But what shall I say to the note which purports to be an extract from *A Pastoral Instruction* of Archbishop Troy, the late Primate of Ireland? Surely it is blasphemy for him to mention the *celestial* primacy of the Pope! I shall only insinuate that it would have been more satisfactory, if instead of referring us to a pastoral, we had been directed to the particular one which contained the passage. I shall, however, again refer to the testimony of the Bishop of Charleston, who authorizes me to state: "that he was during some years well acquainted with Archbishop Troy, and was frequently in his company; that his impression is that he was the last Irish prelate whose hospitality he experienced, and with whom he had much intercourse during the last week of his being in Ireland; that he thinks he read every pastoral instruction issued by that prelate; that he is confident no one that he ever read contained such an expression as that put forward in the note; that from his knowledge of the deceased Irish primate, he is perfectly certain, that he never did, nor would use such an expression, and is quite convinced that the word *celestial* has been substituted for *ecclesiastical*,

which is the appropriate and usual expression, and the very word which in a variety of similar cases he has known the Archbishop to have used." It is true that such evidence as this would not procure a conviction for forgery in a court of justice, nor do I assert that it is a celestial forgery, but I leave to my readers to think what they [please].

The paragraphs 50, 51, and 52, are all very extraordinary negative arguments to disprove the primacy of the Bishop of Rome. I have given some time since, six letters, containing positive proofs to the contrary. Whoever wishes to read them can, if he will, compare the negative and the positive arguments, and draw his own conclusions; I shall not go into the controversy upon this point at present. However, it is very curious, if Bishop Hobart never was aware of the usual practice in judicial assemblies, that the first who delivers his opinion is not the president of the court. And it is also begging the question to assume that St. Ignatius "delineated with the greatest minuteness the Christian hierarchy." And it is an evidence of a want of acquaintance with our doctrine to impute to us even by implication that we consider the papal office to constitute a separate hierarchical order. The writer would have done better had he informed us who was "the corrupt hand of secular power" that gave to the Bishop of the imperial city "the title and prerogatives of Universal Bishop," than so boldly to assume as fact, that which we assert is a fable. It would have argued a little more knowledge of Church history in Bishop Hobart, than he appears to possess, had he not fallen into the glaring inconsistency of adducing the rebuke to the Bishop of Constantinople by the Pope, for his assuming the title of Oecumenical Bishop as proof that the title itself was usurped by Rome: for he ought to have known that in this case Rome rebuked, because it possessed authority, and Constantinople submitted because of its want. That Protestants never admitted the sufficiency of the evidence is no better argument against its sufficiency, than is the non-admission by Presbyterians, of the sufficiency of evidence of the Divine institution of Episcopacy, a warrant for denying that such institution is divine. Is Jesus Christ to be changed in his nature, because the Unitarian does not admit the sufficiency of the evidence that he is the Eternal God? Will the dissent of a minority destroy the force of that evidence upon which the majority rest their conviction? Dr. Barrow's essay is but an extension of the topics urged by every one who has taken the same side, and they have been often and fully met before: many candid inquirers, to my own knowledge, after full and deep examination of the topics urged by him, have been convinced of their insufficiency,

and upon that conviction, deliberately came back to that Christian unity from which their forefathers had been led away.

In his paragraph 53, under the semblance of a concession, he increases the previous misrepresentation. In my second letter to Bishop Bowen, I stated that the following proposition was untrue, viz.:—

"Roman Catholics found their doctrine, that the Scriptures, though being the word of God, are not the entire rule of faith, except as explained by their unwritten traditions, and the authority of their Church, on the pretended infallibility of their Church."

He does not attempt to prove the truth of the proposition, but he asserts that "the Scriptures are according to the Roman Catholic doctrine *only one half*, and that not the most important half of the word of God?" It is not because of his incorrect most, nor because of his only one half; how exactly he measured! but because of the whole scope of this assertion that I now state it to be a misrepresentation of our doctrine: and his next two propositions are equally untrue viz.: "The traditions that explain them [the Scriptures] remain the more important part of divine revelation," "and in this lies the difference between Roman Catholics and Protestants upon this subject." I shall not enter into any examination of the correctness or incorrectness of your mode, or of your contrast: but your correspondent has here been guilty of misrepresenting our doctrine, as also in this other proposition in the same paragraph. Catholics "make the traditions, which while they explain and illustrate them (the Scriptures) are the depository of other and more important revelations than they contain equally with them, their divinely given rule of faith and practice." Now his misrepresentations are first, the assertion "that we believe tradition to be the mode by which we learn more important doctrines than are contained in the Scriptures." Secondly, "that by it we learn as many doctrines as are revealed in the Scriptures," and thirdly, in the equivocation respecting the word unwritten, which he exhibits as meaning "not committed to writing," but which in our authors whom he quotes is always understood to mean "not written in the Bible" though it might be written elsewhere, for instance in the works of the ancient Doctors of the Church, and so forth. I had intended to pass over this without farther remark, until I recollected the playful manner in which a former distinction was disposed of, for the purpose of destroying which, it is possible that celestial was substituted for ecclesiastical: you will therefore excuse me if I now show glaring misrepresentation by a more detailed reference. That your correspondent alleges our traditions to be not written as contradistinguished to written in any book, and not merely in the Holy

Scriptures, is apparent from his calling them oral in paragraph 53, in his first and fourth reasons for the dissent of Protestants. He thus represents us, as raising mere oral tradition to a higher rank than the Scriptures. Yet this man quotes Bellarmine, and takes passages as from the very chapter in which the contrary is found. That author in his lib. iv. cap. 1, has the following passage to explain his meaning of *unwritten word of God.*

Vocatur autem doctrina non scripta, non ea quae nusquam scripta est, sed quae non est scripta a primo auctore: exemplo sit baptismus parvulorum. Parvulos baptizandos vocatur traditio Apostolica non scripta, quia non invenitur hoc scriptum in ullo Apostolico libro, tametsi scriptum est in libris fere omnius veterum patrum.

"That is called unwritten doctrine, not which is nowhere found written, but which is not found written by an original author: for example the baptism of infants. That infants are to be baptized is called an unwritten Apostolical tradition, because this is not found written in any Apostolical book, although it is written in the books of almost all the ancient fathers."

In his twelfth chapter of the same book from which your correspondent affects to quote his passage, the following is found, as the first of the modes by which tradition is preserved.

Prima est scriptura. Etsi enim non sint scriptae traditiones in divine litteris, sunt tamen scriptae in monumentis veterum, et in libris ecclesiasticis.

"The first is writing. For although the traditions be not written in the divine books, yet they are written in the monuments (records) of the ancients, and in ecclesiastical books."

I hope he will not assert that I wrote "celestial books."

It is now plain, that by "written tradition" we do not mean "mere oral tradition."

It is to me truly painful to be perpetually obliged to show how unfaithful, and little worthy of confidence is "Protestant Catholic." He places together a passage of Bellarmine from the second and one from the twelfth chapter of his fourth book, and does not give the latter entire. That from the second chapter is the first sentence which is fully and correctly translated. That from the twelfth chapter is the following.

Totalis enim regula fidei, est verbum Dei, sive revelatio Dei Ecclesiae facta, quae dividitur in duas regulas partiales, scripturam et traditionem. Et quidem Scriptura, quia est regula, inde habet, ut quidquid continet sit necessario verum et credendum, et quidquid ei repugnat, sit necessario falsum et repudiandum: quia vero, non est regula totalis sed partialis; inde illi accidit ut non omnia mensuret, et propterea aliquid sit de fide, quod non in ipsa continetur. Et hoc modo intelligi debeant verba S. Augustini, nusquam enim dicit Scripturam solan esse regulam, sed dicit Scripturam esse regulam, ad quam examinari debent scripta patrum, ut ea recipiamus, quae Scripturae sunt consona; illa rejiciamus quae Scripturae adversantur.

"For the total rule of faith is the word of God, or his revelation to his church; which is divided into two partial rules, scripture and tradition. And indeed Scripture

because it is a rule has this property, that whatsoever it contains is necessarily true and ought to be believed; and whatsoever is repugnant thereto must necessarily be false, and should be rejected: but because it is not a total but a partial rule it is a consequence that it does not measure all things, and therefore something might be of faith which is not contained therein. And in this manner should the words of St. Augustine be understood, for he nowhere says, that the Scripture is the sole rule; but he does say that the Scripture is a rule by which the writings of the fathers ought to be examined, that we might receive those which are consonant to the Scripture; and reject those which are adverse to Scripture.''

I acknowledge that Bossuet and Bellarmine agree. Perhaps the better mode of meeting your assertion respecting the Council of Trent will be to state in the very words of the decree itself, what those traditions are, concerning which the decree was made; they are found in the decree *Concerning the Canonical Scriptures,* passed April 8th, 1546, and are thus described:

Hoc sibi perpetuo ante oculos ponens. Ut sublatis errоribus puritas ipsa Evangelii in Ecclesia conservetur, quod promissum ante per prophetas in scripturis sanctis, Dominus noster Jesus Christus Dei filius, proprio ore primum promulgavit; deinde per suos Apostolos, tanquam fontem omnis salutaris veritatis, et morum disciplinae, omni creaturae praedicari jussit; perspiciensque hanc veritatem, et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis, et sine scripto traditionibus, quae ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptae, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditae, ad nos usque pervenerunt, orthodoxorum Patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam veteris, quam novi testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, nec non traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tamquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictitatas, et continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu, ac reverentia suscipit, et veneratur.

''Continually having in view, that errors being removed, the very truth of the Gospel might be preserved in the church: that which was before promised by the Prophets in the sacred Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, the son of God, first promulgated with his own mouth; then ordered it to be preached to every creature by his Apostles, as the fountain of all, both saving truth and discipline of morals: and (the synod) seeing that this truth and discipline is contained in written books, and in unwritten traditions, which having been received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the Apostles at the dictation of the Holy Ghost, have come to us as if delivered by hands, following the examples of the orthodox fathers, receives and venerates with equal affection and reverence, all the books as well of the Old as of the New Testament, since the one God is the author of both, as well as of the traditions themselves, as well belonging to faith as to morals, as either received from the mouth of Christ, or dictated by the Holy Ghost, and preserved by continual succession in the Catholic Church.''

In this your correspondent copies Father Paul word for word, and it is one of his most correct statements. It is clear, then, that the traditions are not what he calls oral, nor are they any other but such as by the evidence of the whole church have been derived from the mouth of Christ or of his Apostles.

He vouchsafes to quote even me, after those high authorities, to prove from my statement "that the principal revelations of the Saviour" having been made at a time of which we have no scriptural record of the revelation that was made, I must have said that such communications were more important than any delivered to the churches by the Apostles in their Epistles,—and thus he might justify his previous assertion in the same paragraph. "The Scriptures, according to Roman Catholic doctrine, are only half, and that not the most important half, of the word of God." Now the word principal is equally susceptible of the meaning which I intended to convey, "numerous," as that which he attached to it, "important." But probably both meanings might be sustained by verse 3, of chapter i. of the *Acts of the Apostles,* as well as by *John* xvi. 12, 13; xiv. 25, 26, 30; xxi. 25.

I shall not here controvert his arguments: I shall merely correct his misstatements. His first reason for not concurring with us, assumes against the fact that those traditions are oral, not written: and that we assert what is not written to be more important, what is written to be less important.—All which is untrue.

His second reason improperly shifts the ground. We do not state that the Apostles "did not think it good or expedient publicly to impart to the disciples" articles of belief of which they had the knowledge amongst themselves. But we do state, our having evidence that they did teach doctrines and institute practices, necessary for faith and morals, concerning which they never wrote documents that have reached us, or been publicly known in the church as theirs, and we do find in their writings allusions and references to unwritten teaching. One or two passages will suffice for present reference. (*I Cor* .xi. 2; *II Thess.* ii. 15.)

His third begs the question.

His fourth assumes a false basis, oral.

His fifth is extremely unfortunate in its specifications. The millenarian error was founded upon *Revelations* xx. 2, 3, 4, 5, and other texts. It is a little strange, good gentlemen, that your correspondent does not seem to be aware that Luther and Calvin, and several of their followers, produced many texts of Scripture upon which they contended against Catholics, that the saints would not see God until the resurrection. The necessity of giving the Eucharist to children was sustained upon the text of *John* vi. 53, 54, and others.

His sixth reason consists of two parts: the first is neither controverted by me, nor sufficient for his purpose; the second part is untrue in fact, as might be easily shown in several instances.

His last reason, as applied to doctrine, is altogether untrue,—let him show the particulars.

Upon his quotation from Bishop White, I shall make but a passing observation, that if I admit his principle in the concluding remark, it will establish all for which I care to contend. I believe the legislature and courts of any civilized nation to be fully competent, not only to declare that the statutes and usages which are by them recognised as law are the law; but I believe that it is only by their authority they are known to be such. And this was the sense of St. Augustine, when he declared that he would not believe in the Gospel, but upon the authority of the church; that it is perfectly reasonable, is plain from the fact, that the church pre-existed to the Gospel, and that she taught her doctrines before the Gospel was written, and that it was only by her testimony, the fact of their inspiration and divine authority has been established. Her public tribunals give this testimony not only to the written Gospel, but to more than is written in the Gospel. I believe with Bishop White, that there is no species of evidence more generally acted on, or less liable to be deceptive.

My complaint against the *Catechism* and against your correspondent is, for having misrepresented what we mean by tradition; and for having misrepresented us in the attempt to show that we preferred it to the Scriptures.

I shall add one remark upon his note. He says that "there is no need of considering tradition to be kept right amongst the great body of the faithful by an extraordinary divine influence over the mind."—My answer is, if God promised to preserve the knowledge of truth amongst the great body of the faithful by such influence, it is necessary to believe that he will fulfil his promise. If this tradition be of "high and inestimable importance" to ascertain "the sense in which the Apostles, and so forth, held the words of Christ in relation to his mission, offices, and nature," and so forth,—if the having true doctrine upon those subjects be so necessary as to cause the Son of God to vouchsafe to become our teacher: this extraordinary divine teaching must have been considered necessary by God; and when he declares he will be with those who teach this doctrine by his commission "always, even to the end of the world," (*Matt.* xxviii. 20), and keep the Spirit of truth "to abide with them" "for ever," (*John* xiv. 16, 17), it has the full appearance of evidence that such influence upon the general mind of the great body of the teachers, was not only necessary, but assured; and such assurance is the only guarantee which men can have, for the perfect certainty essential to faith. "The supposition of such an influence is

attended with insuperable difficulties." I acknowledge, gentlemen, that to a Protestant, if he desire so to continue, it must; for if such influence be once admitted, he must become a member of "the great body of the faithful." But to a Roman Catholic it presents no difficulty, but it removes all doubt, and creates perfect repose in his certainty of the guidance of the spirit of truth.

The topic in his paragraph 57 is not worth a remark.

The fifty-ninth adduces motives to prove that the statement in fifty-eight is not a misrepresentation. I shall briefly advert to them.

If it be a denial of the free use of the Scriptures to use proper care that the editions and translations be correct, then the charge against us is true.

If it be a denial of the free use of the Scriptures to declare that the meaning of the books and passages is that which the great body of the faithful have, by the proper use of tradition, known it to be, then the charge is true. But if it be an abuse to deviate from "that sense in which the Apostles held the words of Christ in relation to his mission, offices, and nature," and from "that sense in which the first Christians held the words of these Apostles as to such and other points spoken of, or referred to in their writings," we only guard against that abuse. And as "the account furnished by tradition" is on those points by Protestants "regarded as of high and inestimable authority," and this account can only be known by the unanimous consent of the fathers, and the constant and undeviating judgment of the church, it is to be hoped that in preventing an abuse, we shall not be charged with taking away the free use, unless free use and abuse be synonymous. If they are, we plead guilty.

The rule of the Index is not a general law of the church, and has no force, except in those places where it has been adopted, which are, comparatively speaking, very few. The note here is, therefore, an untrue statement.

Pope Leo XII. only did his duty in admonishing the pastors of the church to warn their flocks against imagining your Bibles to be either accurately translated or perfect copies, because they are neither.

My object not being a controversy upon the merits of the question, but a vindication of my former statements, I shall not proceed, as I might, to show that, in the English Protestant Church from which you are sprung, the same principle exists and is frequently enforced. Why do you call other Protestants heretics, for merely making the free use of their own judgment in the interpretation of the Scripture? The Unitarian only makes free use of the Scripture, yet you condemn him with

equal decision, but not with equal scurrility as we are condemned for merely the free use of our own judgment, in determining how we may best arrive at the sense of the words which the sacred volume contains.

You will not allow a person to belong to your communion who professes that, in the exercise of his judgment, he cannot believe Jesus Christ was an incarnate God. You tell him to read the Scriptures, and make free use of the Bible; he tells you that, after having done so, he cannot understand those texts as you do; neither can he, after that free use, see why you assert that bishops are superior to priests, or that presbyterial ordination is invalid, or that the administration of the sacraments should be confined to a privileged order; neither can he see it is conformable to God's ordinances that a formal liturgy should be used: yet he claims to be a member of your church. He is a good moral man, zealous for the free use and distribution of the Bible, of splendid intellect, of winning manners, of estimable and extensive benevolence, desirous of officiating for a vacant church of yours, by the great body of whose members he is held in high esteem. Will its pulpit be open for him? Yet he addresses you. "Gentlemen, it is true, you tell me, that I am free to use the Scriptures, but not my understanding in order to know what they teach and require." "Can any" Protestant Episcopalian "on earth deny this to be true, and the only true account of the matter?"

Gentlemen, whatever the effect of the restriction may be, one effect of the abuse of the Scriptures certainly has been more sectarian hatred, animosity, ill-will, malice, misrepresentation, strife, envy, contention, and falsehood, than has proceeded from any other cause that I know of. The simple questions ought to be, "Can all the contradictory meanings attributed to this book be correct?" No one will assert that they can. "Has it any true and consistent meaning?" We agree that it has. "How shall that correct and consistent meaning be ascertained?" We answer, by the same mode by which the meaning of any ancient public document can be ascertained: by the testimony of the tribunal which was charged with its preservation, its interpretation, and with the execution of its provisions, supported as it is by the collateral testimony of all the sages who expounded it from the earliest times, and the nations which have been led by its regulations. "No, no!" you answer, "let everybody interpret for himself, and act upon his own interpretation." You have thus flung the document abroad, and proclaimed the license: why will you condemn those who act upon your principle? Why condemn even us, who take the document and judge for ourselves? Gentlemen, you may declaim against our ignorance as your correspondent

does in paragraph 60, but you mistake: the Bible is better known amongst Catholics than is any other book in existence, and it is more attentively read. And from your own books, and from your own acts, Catholics, in those countries in which Protestants are found, know your tenets, your principles, and your arguments, with infinitely more accuracy than you know those of our church. In other countries, where Protestants are not found, it does frequently happen that the great body of the people have as little knowledge of your particular tenets, of your special discipline, and of the nature of your institutions, as the members of the American Protestant Episcopal Church, or of the Church of England, have of the tenets, discipline and institutions of the Nestorians, the Eutychians, or any other of the Eastern, Christian separatists from the great body of the faithful. Yet this ignorance is compatible with a knowledge of their own religion, and of the contents of the Bible. Nor would a study of the Bible supply a knowledge of the nature and practices of a church whose characteristic peculiarities are mere denials of what those persons believe to be authorized by that religion which the Bible upholds.

I shall endeavour to conclude my remarks next week, and remain, gentlemen, Your obedient, humble servant, B. C.

LETTER XVII.

But this, whatever evil she conceived,
Did spread abroad, and throw in the open wind;
Yet this in all her words might be perceived,
That all she sought was men's good names to have bereaved;
For whatever good by any said,
Or done, she would straightways invent
How to deprave, or slanderously upbraid,
Or to misconstrue of a man's intent,
And turn to ill the thing that well was meant.
To hark what any one did good report,
To blot the same with blame or wreck in wicked sort.
And if that any ill she heard of any.
She would it take, and make it worse by telling
And take great joy to publish it to many,
That every matter worse was for her melling.

Spenser.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 21, 1829.

To the Editors:

Gentlemen:—There now remain but few topics to be disposed of; and upon those few topics there is not much discussion required by the

principle under which I act, for the misrepresentations which they contain are comparatively few and easily rectified. The sixty-first paragraph of your correspondent well and pathetically laments the consequences of your principle; and naturally resolves itself into the doctrine of infallibility as the only efficient remedy. We say that the Saviour of the world was influenced by the view of those consequences to provide thus against the evil: we have, on our side, the example of the precept given by God in *Deuteronomy* xvii. to the people of Israel; as well as of the precept given by the Saviour himself in *Matthew* xviii. 17, together with the promises of his special abiding to preserve his church in truth all days to the end of the world, and many other evidences which it is here unnecessary to adduce. But your correspondent is pleased to say, that "it were vain, perhaps, to expect, in the present day, to secure the attention of any intelligent reader to an argument either for or against the Roman Catholic doctrine of the church's infallibility." I, of course, will call this prejudice, or judgment made up before its grounds are examined; he will, perhaps, give it some other name. Is he aware of the anathemas used by St. Paul? (*I Cor.* xvi. 22; *Gal.* i. 8, 9). I need not go to any higher authority to support the declarations of the church, that whosoever corrupts the doctrine of Christ is anathema. The church condemns no one to eternal penalties, because she has no such power. But she does declare, for she is commissioned by Christ so to do, the doctrine which he taught, and the penalties under which he commands it to be received; and she would be unfaithful to her commission, if she did not proclaim what she was commanded to teach all days to the end of the world. If she proclaims a falsehood, it is folly to believe that God will be bound to execute the judgment which she declares; the eternal or temporal penalty, in a future state, must be enacted and inflicted by God, and by him alone. The church claims no such power. Your curious correspondent adds to his misrepresentations when he asserts she does. Let him adduce the laws which enact temporal penalties. There is no such law of the Catholic Church. Catholic nations and Protestant nations have had such laws. Does he desire their abolition? Let him begin amongst ourselves. Let him make North Carolina and New Jersey cease to be a reproach amongst us. Catholics first introduced the principle and the practice of religious liberty upon our consecrated soil: let Protestants complete what Catholics began. Let them tell the North Carolinan Catholic, and the New Jersey Catholic, that they shall no longer pay the penalty of exclusion from office for the profession of their faith.

In that same paragraph he misrepresents us, when he says, that

"a few multiplied by their own will into the Catholic or universal church," can make "an absolute and unchangable determination of the sense of Scripture." Because, in the first place the determination cannot be made by "a few," but by a large body, lawfully representing the entire millions of the universal church; because it is not "their own will that multiplies them," but the general will which recognises them as the proper organs of its expression; and thirdly, because even those representatives of the general will of the universal church cannot alter the sense which has been received from the days of the Apostles, and testified in all ages by the unanimous consent of the fathers. I am not astonished that, as he proceeds, in this paragraph, your correspondent should feel himself embarrassed by the practice of your church, and flounder, as he does, into a paramount authority which your church assumes, but which he would not grant to either the early Christians or the Jews, respecting even the simple division of the Decalogue in its proper heads. "This modification of the doctrine," as he calls it, might be very convenient to him who is a member of a church that will never admit she is wrong, though she admits she may be wrong. Which is, indeed, such infallibility in fact as made a judicious person remark, that the essential difference between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church was to be found in this, that the first never is in error, and the second never can err, in declaring the doctrines that Christ taught. Hence your sapient and discriminating correspondent would be content, were we only to declare that it was of indispensable necessity to conform to the decisions of the Church until she shall change or qualify her doctrines. We have, however, this very serious objection, that we do not believe the Church has power to change or qualify any doctrine which God has revealed. This, in truth, is the great obstacle which prevents our acceding to his suggestion. When he shall have satisfied us that we may conscientiously conform to what is not the doctrine of Christ, until the church shall see fit to qualify or renounce the error; all the difficulty will be removed. When we find any general council determining infallibly that a former general council was wrong in a doctrinal decision, we shall then be quite ready to tell him why it might be done. We are content at present with the knowledge, that during eighteen centuries it has not occurred, and believing upon the promises of Christ that it will never occur. In our view of the case, it would be more reasonable and practically useful for us to discuss at present where we should place the spires of the churches, to prevent their being crushed when the moon shall strike our side of the globe.

Your correspondent makes a very sad mistake in his conjecture as

to the "probable reason" for our not renouncing transubstantiation. To save him the trouble of speculating, I shall inform him of the fact. The true reason why we retain the doctrine is, because we have the fullest evidence that it was always preserved by the great bulk of the faithful, and testified by the unanimous consent of the fathers, as taught by our Saviour Jesus Christ, and we find the same evidence in the Scriptures.

In viewing the paragraph 62, I shall give your correspondent the credit of honesty; but it must be at the expense of his information. If I err he can correct me. I beg leave to inform him that the Catholic Church neither now teaches, nor did she ever teach "that the Pope can absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance to Protestant Princes." He says, "it has undeniably been the established sense of the Roman Catholic Church." I have now denied what he says is undeniable. I suppose his meaning to be that it is a doctrine of the church, and that this power was an essential part of the papal authority. He says also, "that Popes have undeniably maintained the position, that faith is not to be kept with hereties." I know not what evidence he might possess of the private sayings of a Pope, or a number of them. But I do deny that any Pope did promulgate any such position, as a doctrine of the Church. Let him now produce his facts, because he says, "these things are matters of historical facts too well known to be disputed." I not only dispute, but I deny that they are facts.

To support the first, he adduces the fact, that Pius V. absolved the subjects of Elizabeth of England, from their oaths of allegiance. The act of the Pope is not evidence of the doctrine in this instance for several reasons. First. The power of absolving subjects from their oaths of allegiance by the Pope, was a grant made by most of the sovereigns of Europe at several periods, when they were members of a common church; they appointed him, who was their spiritual head, as their common arbiter, and armed him with power to execute the common law of nations which they had enacted in congress, and one of which laws did empower Pius to issue this sentence. The only question which could, therefore, arise was whether the church taught as a portion of her doctrine, that the Pope had such a power in virtue of his succession to St. Peter, as the head of the Church; or whether he had it by the constitution of the Congress of Christian powers. The Church never taught that he had it upon the first ground. She saw that he had it upon the second ground, but it was a public fact, not a doctrine of religion. The subjects of Elizabeth were then absolved in virtue of a national law of Europe, not in virtue of a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. It was, however, successfully and legally contended that the kingdom

of England, being a sovereign power, and having withdrawn publicly from the agreement, was no longer bound by its ordinances; and that this absolution was therefore void. Elizabeth herself, had such serious doubts of the sufficiency of the reasoning, that she preferred applying to Pius for the revocation of the sentence, which, however, she did not obtain. Her subjects, Catholic and Protestant, were satisfied with the reasoning, and no one attempted to carry the sentence into execution, until several years afterwards, Philip of Spain, for his own private purposes, induced Sixtus V. to renew the publication; and the English Catholics were the most zealous to repel the invaders, should they effect a landing; and they were never considered by this act of opposition to Sixtus and Philip, to have swerved from the doctrine or duties of their church. Thus the fact of the publication of such a sentence, does not prove that it is the doctrine of our Church—that the head of that Church has the power of absolving from the oath of allegiance to Protestant princes or powers. The law of nations, by which the power once existed, has been long since repealed by opposition and disuse.

The Church considers kings and princes to be men, and as such, members of the great body of the faithful, neither above her power nor beyond her censure. She does not find that Jesus Christ made any particular exception in their favour, and although your correspondent might venerate royalty above discipline, such is not, I will avow, the spirit of our Church. Our Chrysostoms, and Ambroses, and Gregories, and Beckets, and Langtons, had the spirit, as they had the faith of John the Baptist, and they were as ready to say to an emperor as to a beggar "this is not lawful for thee," and to denounce the one as well as the other; for they are taught to be no respecters of persons. Your correspondent may amuse himself with reference to false decretals, published subsequent to the days when the facts to which I refer occurred. When I think he knows something more of the history of those decretals, than I believe he does, I shall expect him to inform me how they may be justly and legally binding, and yet in one sense be false. It is easy to give ugly names to men who are the glory of their age; but it is exceeding strange in the midst of republican institutions, to find the vindicators of public liberty in their day, against the lawless despots of the feudal times, branded by men who claim to be republicans, with appellations too bad even for the tyrants themselves. But those men that do those things have one excuse, "they know not what they do," when they repeat the libels for which monarchs have richly rewarded venal scribes.

The few and insulted Catholics of this city, as far as I can learn, despise your correspondent's professed complaisance to them: they

claim no superiority over their fellow-citizens of any other place or denomination, either in virtue or in patriotism; they are content to be upon the level of their fellow-citizens in their civic duties, and of every other Roman Catholic in the world, in doctrine and belief. They pay full spiritual and ecclesiastical obedience to the See of Rome, and with as thorough a love of civil liberty, as any other citizen of these states; they acknowledge in their tenets nothing which endangers either that liberty, or the tranquillity of the land. By you and by others, their feelings have been wounded, their doctrines misrepresented, their practices vilified, their ceremonial ridiculed, and themselves held up to contempt. Anti-Christ, idolater, heathen, persecutor, intruding stranger, slave or corruption, unclean thing, and vicious, are phrases with which they have been assailed in a state which boasts of its liberality, and vaunts its superior civilization, purity of taste, and its chivalrous honour. God forbid that I should deny that South Carolina is entitled to those characteristics! But the more elevated her dignity, the more humiliating is the reproach of and amongst her children to us! Are we suspected of disaffection to the civil institutions which we labour to uphold? Did we desert our brethren of other creeds, in the day of the invasion? Did we conspire against their domestic peace, and following our own notions of Scripture liberty, whisper aught that might overwhelm us in unforseen ruin? Was our blood or our treasure withheld in any day of peril? Is the charter of your liberties perfect without our name? Did we preach against the acts of your Congress, in the midst of a conflict with the enemies of the land? Did we ever express a reluctance to act against a Catholic, as soon as we would against a Protestant foe? What, then, in the name of Heaven, is the cause of the continual allusion to the dangers of the Republic, from our body? We have never entered into combinations to paralyse the force of the nation, when the enemy was ravaging our shores and burning our capitol. Let your correspondent refer to the history of our common country, which perhaps he understands, in place of dragging us to feudal times, in Europe, of which he knows so little.

I cannot and will not stoop to notice the miserable and dishonourable distinction which he touches, in his second note upon this sixty-second paragraph, where he tells us that he does not charge the Pope with being dishonest in retail, but in wholesale; it is not in small transactions that Catholics are rogues, but in mighty concerns. I fling back his insult with the feelings which it so richly merits. I defy him to the proof. He treat of honesty! He treat of good faith! Let him look to his garbling.

Even in the third note to this paragraph, he gives us "doomed by

anathema to damnation," as the translation of *anathemate damnentur*, "should be condemned by anathema," the common modes of expression for persons convicted of holding erroneous doctrines.

He has modestly half-abandoned the charge, "countenancing and commanding persecution, massacre, and murder."

He asks, why do not our councils or Popes disclaim those imputed doctrines? I ask: "Who would dare to ask the Congress of the Union to disclaim having held that piracy and sacrilege were virtues?" No rule of common action requires that the calumniated body should volunteer a useless disclaimer. To disclaim, would imply that there was an apparent ground for the calumny. Why does not the calumniator retract? This is a most natural question. But they who gave origin and currency to the falsehoods, have long since passed away. Would to God their evil deeds had been buried with them!

"The canon and decrees, and dogmas of Popery, yet unrepealed and unrenounced, embody the power and right to punish temporarily for religion's sake, and pursue heresy and schism with spiritual denunciations." All this I admit to be true, "and temporal inflictions." This I deny, and I defy him to prove. He adds: "Protestantism knows nothing of the kind." I refer him to North Carolina: I refer him to New Jersey. I need not cross the Atlantic; if I did, I would go to some of the Protestant cantons of Switzerland; I would say, that whilst the ink was flowing from his pen, as he wrote the paragraph, he could have known that the head of the English Church had laid aside the character of Protestant persecutor, which his predecessor had well deserved for two centuries and a half. He ought now to recollect what a powerful effort the prelates and pastors, of the Protestant Church made to perpetuate the persecution. He ought not to force me to remind him of the part which was acted here by several of the Protestant clergy, in favour of the Greeks, and to ask where they were, when their flocks nobly aided to break the fetters of the British and Irish Catholics? Prudence is sometimes found, where neither charity nor generosity exist.

With his concluding remarks, I have no concern; I have been too tedious and too diffuse; I am anxious to lay down my pen. Truth and principle demanded much from me: assailed as my positions have been, I know not my assailant; I therefore could have had no personal feeling against him; though, if I should discover who he is, I trust my charity for him will be perfect; but I cannot say that my respect for him would be enhanced by the merit of his production.

Should any expression unkind, uncharitable, or unnecessarily severe,

have escaped me, I regret it; and pray you, gentlemen, to believe that none such was intended to annoy you, or your fellow-religionists.

In the spirit of charity, peace, and truth,

Your obedient, humble servant,

B. C.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 11.

To the Editors of the United States Catholic Miscellany:

Gentlemen:—In the number of the *Gospel Messenger* for the present month, I have read the following paragraph, which is satisfactory evidence of the candour and honesty with which the editors conduct that press:

"The quotation which was made by a writer, whose numbers appeared in our work, under the signature of a 'Protestant Catholic,' from the translated *Missal* used in this city, in connexion with his remarks on the Roman Catholic worship of saints and angels, was made, we are satisfied, in perfect fairness, and without the least intention of applying to his purpose an error of the translator, or of the press. That the comma at the words 'make intercession for us,' instead of a period, is an error of the press, or of the translator, we are since perfectly satisfied. The *Latin Missal*, and other translations which we have seen, of the part of the Roman Catholic Offices referred to, have, make intercession for us. The prayer here addressed to the men and women saints, is for their intercession, and not for their mercy. The prayer to canonized saints, for their intercession in behalf of supplicants at their shrines, in the same office with prayer addressed to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, remains admitted, and we should suppose is enough for the purpose of our correspondent: who, we are sure, will not disapprove of the notice we have felt it proper to take of his error, in using against Roman Catholics, a wrong translation of a passage of their *Missal*."

Had the "Protestant Catholic" correspondent taken the trouble to instruct himself on what he wrote, I would have been spared considerable labour, and you, sirs, would have been relieved from loading your pages with the weekly refutations of insipid and often refuted charges against our doctrine.

I have, gentlemen, to make my acknowledgments to you, for the facility which you have given to the publication of my humble defence of the principles of our holy faith, as well on the present, as on former occasions. In a few more letters, I will dismiss the "Protestant Catholic," in the hope that he will, in future, study and prepare himself on Catholic doctrine, before he shall again hazard such charges against us.

Yours, sincerely,

B. C.

[From the *United States Catholic Miscellany* of July 5, 1828. Referred to in the preceding Letters.]

To the Right Reverend Doctor England, Bishop of Charleston:

Right Reverend Sir:—The Editors of the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, beg leave to call your attention to a curious and extraordinary piece of information of which they have been put in possession, and hope you will have the kindness before they proceed to make any further use of it, to elucidate the circumstances in such a manner as to remove the unfavourable impressions which such a report is calculated to make on the minds of persons unacquainted with the doctrines of the Catholic Church.

They have heard it asserted as a fact, and they know it is believed by many, that you, Right Reverend Sir, had advertised indulgences for sale, and that the advertisement was placed on the door of your church. From the character of one person, who, it seems, says he saw it there, they have reason to think it was not a tale forged by him, but that he might have seen something else there which he mistook for it. Such is the substance of a report that is currently circulated; and anxiously waiting your explanation on the subject.

We remain, Right Reverend Sir,

Your most obedient, humble servants,

EDITORS of the *United States Catholic Miscellany*.

WENTWORTH STREET, July 1, 1828.

To the Editors of the United States Catholic Miscellany:

Gentlemen:—You had, indeed, good cause to designate as curious and extraordinary the piece of information which you convey to me. But how am I to correct the evil? I know, and I surely need not inform you, that the entire statement is as unqualified an untruth as was ever whispered about. However wealthy, or aristocratically descended, or gifted with talents, or otherwise correct in his deportment, the person whom you accuse and excuse might be, or whatever the situation he might fill, I cannot so far mock truth as to admit that it would be even charitable to suppose that he did see upon the church door any advertisement which he could mistake for one notifying the sale of indulgences by me. I cannot surmise to what individual you allude, nor do I wish to know, because I should prefer not being aware of who has thus far degraded himself, to being obliged to estimate him as I should after the discovery. May he repent and be forgiven! The only notice concerning indulgences that has ever been published by advertisement on the

church doors by me, or by my authority, or with my knowledge, is that of the Jubilee—you have the copy and can use that and this letter as you please.

I have been the instrument of communicating indulgences to thousands of persons during the twenty years that I have been in the ministry, and have known hundreds of clergymen similarly circumstanced, and I never have myself received, nor have I known one of them to receive directly or indirectly the value of one cent for such ministerial duty. Yet my denial is of little value as regards those who have made up their minds that things must be, as unprincipled writers have stated them to be. I cannot wonder at the belief of stories imported from Europe and Asia, when stories like this are believed by the very persons in whose society I am daily found.

To receive such information as yours, is no novelty to me: I have yesterday been told by a respectable Protestant lady, that she had to defend me from the charge of trafficking in the sale of indulgences upon my arrival here, but that finding the people too well informed, and the profits small, I thought proper to lay aside the commerce. You can well conceive how mortifying it must be to me to know that frequently the religion of our blessed Saviour, and even my humble self should be thus treated in the highest circles of our society; and by persons whose information on other subjects I respect and admire, but who, where our Church is concerned, speak unmeasuredly and mercilessly of what they have never studied, and therefore do not understand. I assure you, gentlemen, that the hardihood of assertion and absence of information upon the subject of our religion is so great as to have at first excited my extreme astonishment: but custom is the best mode of removing admiration. I can now calmly hear what I once thought no person would venture to assert, and I have long been enabled patiently to know myself described as guilty of such acts as if perpetrated by me would stamp my character as that of an unprincipled, sacrilegious, dishonest, simonaical deceiver, and my flock as the most egregious simpletons. I have been insensibly led on, without feeling that I have far exceeded the limits within which I intended to confine myself. I regret to find that your statement of public report is considerably under what I know to be the fact. But we must have patience and persevere. The people of America will examine and though slowly, will finally discover the truth.

Yours, JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

This unqualified disavowal is nothing more or less than we expected, so perfectly satisfied were we in our mind, from the general

character of the prelate upon whom this strange and malignant charge was attempted to be fastened, that he would not be guilty of an act which his religion not only forbids, but the perpetration of which would expose him to the heaviest penalties which that Church, of which he is a minister, could inflict upon him. But our duty as Journalists, responsible to the public for the truth of each and every statement we make, compelled us, however disagreeable to our own, or hurtful to the feelings of the respectable individual concerned, to lay before him the information we received, and thus afford him an opportunity of vindicating his character and his religion, before the tribunal of public opinion, and of covering with merited confusion, an injudicious, careless being, who reported as a fact, what he never examined, or having axamined, circulated as truth what he knew to be a falsehood. We are well aware the trafficked indulgence alluded to, is the one which was published together with the Jubilee in the Cathedral Church of this city, on the 5th of November, 1826. Now, we ourselves have conversed with hundreds, who to the best of their powers, endeavoured to perform the conditions upon which the benefits derivable from that indulgence could be obtained; we have heard these conditions distinctly and audibly published from more than four altars in this Diocess; we have seen manuscript copies of them, sanctioned by the signature of the Bishop of Charleston, we have seen printed ones of them confirmed by the same authority, and signature; and from all that we could gather from those with whom we have spoken, from all we could hear, from all we could see, and from all we could read, we could learn nothing of money, or bartering, or traffic; we never could ascertain that Bishop England proposed changing the temple of the living God into a simoniacal counting-house, the altar of his penniless Master, into a vile money-table, nor the *Missal* of his creed into a mercenary ledger. We fortunately have lying before us on our table a printed copy of these conditions; we gladly insert them for the gratification of our readers, and if they, or our trust-worthy reporter, can extract anything in the shape of money from the duties here prescribed, we despair not, that in a short time, by some other unheard of experiment, they may be able to discover the *maximum desideratum,* or the philosopher's stone.

"*Conditions to be fulfilled in order to obtain the benefit of the Indulgence of the Jubilee, at present in the City of Charleston.*

"1st. To make a good confession and communion.

"2d. To visit at least four times within the space of one week,

at any time of the day which may be most convenient, each of the following three altars, viz.: that of the Church of Hassell Street, the large altar at the Cathedral, and the small altar at the Cathedral, repeating at each of them, at least, the Lord's prayer and the Hail Mary, each five times, and the Creed once, at each visit, to beseech God for the conversion of all those who are in error of faith, or in habits of immorality, and that he would vouchsafe to enlighten the understandings of men to see truth, and incline their hearts to its belief and to reduce its principles to practice.

"3d. To attend during the said week at least at three masses and three instructions, in Hassell Street Church; or if there is a serious obstacle to prevent attendance at the mass, either the five decades of the Rosary, or the Litany of Saints may be substituted therefor.

"4th. In any special case in which, through sickness or infirmity, or other reasonable cause, it will not be in the power of the person desirous of obtaining the benefits of the Indulgence to comply with either of the conditions No. 2, No. 3, the confessor is empowered to substitute some other condition which may be performed.

ORDER OF PROCEEDING DAILY.

"Meditation read after morning prayer, which prayer shall commence at 6 o'clock—Mass at 7 o'clock.

"Ten o'clock, Mass, and exhortation.

"Half-past 6 o'clock, p. m. short prayer, short instruction, longer prayer and sermon, after will be a hymn and music. These exercises to continue during this week.

†JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

Nov. 5, 1826.

PART II

CONTROVERSY

CONTROVERSY

JUDICIAL OFFICE OF THE CHURCH

Letters addressed to the Rev. Hugh Smith, A.M.

[From the *United States Catholic Miscellany* for 1826.]

LETTER I.

CHARLESTON, S. C., July 25, 1826.

To the Rev. Hugh Smith, A.M., Rector of St. Paul's Church, Augusta.

Rev. Sir:—I am not, I trust, disposed to turn from my path to assail persons who permit me to pass unmolested; but neither am I very willing to allow myself to be assailed by an unprovoked aggressor. You, Sir, preached at the opening of the late Convention of your Church, (the Protestant Episcopal,) at Macon, in Georgia; and the Editors of the *Gospel Messenger* in this city, considered your Sermon worthy of the first place in their publication for this month.

Had you not unnecessarily waged war upon my religion, I should have laid down the pamphlet without an observation; but your language has urged me to the remarks which I shall take the liberty of making through the columns of the *Miscellany*.

If I am correctly informed, Reverend Sir, you are no novice in polemics, and you have frequently ere now, given to the religion of my choice the full benefit of your opposition; though, if report speaks truly, you have not always been successful. I have heard it said of you, that not very many years since you asserted that the General Councils of Popery, (as your politeness has designated the religion of the vast majority of Christendom,) could not be infallible in their decisions upon articles of faith, because they were contradictory; and that when invited to point out the contradictions, you were not prepared to do so, because you had forgotten them, and could not then lay your hand upon the books which exhibited what they were. This, perhaps, is but a mere unfounded report, and I am the more inclined to believe so, from the circumstance that your present assault is upon the same doctrine

of infallibility in the attempt to destroy which you are said to have been formerly so notoriously unsuccessful; because it would appear to be a singular fatality which would lead you into the same field, with only the same weapons, against the same doctrine.

However, Sir, I may be in error:—you are probably now much better armed; and you shew at least more caution. Still, your caution has not, I believe, saved you from exposing how you might be advantageously assailed; but this was probably more a misfortune arising from your position, than a fault arising from your want of skill. I must avow that I should not know how to defend the ground you occupied: but as our acquaintance must be of some duration, I had better proceed at once to my business. As I love open dealing, I shall give the portion of your sermon of which I complain, and also those parts which will be necessary to place you fairly before my readers.

Your text was—"With one mind, striving together for the faith of the Gospel." *Philippians* i, 29.

You alluded to the occasion of your holding a Convention in a place which, not long since, was a wilderness. You enforced the necessity of having the Gospel defended by some when attacked by others. You enforced the obligation as considered in its reference to Christianity generally, in concluding which topic you said:

"Thus, then, it appears, that there has been but one sentiment in the Christian world as to the duty of 'contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints,' when that faith was assailed; and, that in reference to this general defence, those who differ from each other on minor points, may and ought to 'strive together;' not, however, by attempting that union or coalition, which, from the infirmity of our nature, and from a warm attachment to different views, never can exist; that union which forced, and almost unnatural, instead of tending to harmony, too frequently ministers to strife; not by being 'unequally yoked together,' by a yoke that will prove galling to both. No, not thus, brethren, are they who believe in Christianity, but differ as to its peculiarities; not thus, are they to strive together; but by marching in separate columns to the defense of the truth, by separately directing their efforts to one and the same point, and causing them to meet in the same centre; thus, securing the benefits of combined exertion, while they avoid the dangers of collision.

"There is a general coincidence, then, brethren, as to what is the faith of the Gospel, viz: the Revelation of God, contained in the Bible, and, for this faith, it is admitted that all should, in a certain sense, strive together. But when we leave this general ground; when we ask what

the 'faith of the Gospel' is, in all its parts, coincidence of sentiment is at an end, and many contradictory replies meet our ear. How, then, are we to choose amidst all these conflicting opinions of men? 'How is this faith of the Gospel to be more minutely ascertained?' This is our second inquiry. What is to be our standard of appeal? We point you, in reply, to the Book of God. We ask you, 'What is there written? how readest thou?' Yes, to the Bible we make our first apeal; for, in the language of the great Chillingworth, 'The Bible is the Religion of Protestants.' In exact accordance with which, we find the Church declaring in her 6th Article, 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.'

"You may ask, however, are there not many who appeal to this standard, equally honest in purpose, and equally earnest in seeking, and who return from its perusal with widely different impressions? Does not every Christian sect profess to hold the pure 'faith of the Gospel,' and to have derived its doctrinal compend or digest from the Bible.

"It is indeed so, brethren: nor should this fact excite our surprise, or drive us from that most safe position, that to the Bible must be our first apeal. But, be it remembered, that it must be the Bible interpreted by enlightened reason; by the comparison of its several parts with each other; and in entire subserviency to the unquestionable axiom, that a revelation from God cannot contain anything that will impugn his known attributes, or detract from his infinite perfections.

"Had it always been thus interpreted, notwithstanding the varieties in the structure of the human mind, the Christian world would not have been called to witness so many divisions and sub-divisions, modifications and remodifications of doctrinal incorrectness. Nor would the Bible itself have been insulted, by being given as the authority for so much that is absurd in theory, or demoralizing in practical tendency. Perfect uniformity of sentiment, even were all the circumstances of spiritual preparation, and of biblical investigation equal, could scarcely be expected. Nor is this more surprising than that God has permitted men to receive different impressions from the same sounds, the same views, the same subject; and the want of this uniformity in the inferences honestly drawn from Scripture must never drive us back to that main pillar, and main error of Popery, that the Church is the authorized interpreter of Scripture. Against this, the Church of which we are members has entered her own protest; declaring in her 20th Article, 'It is not lawful for the Church to decree anything contrary to God's word written; neither may

it so explain one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so, beside the same, ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.'

"Scripture, then, being our first witness as to the faith of the Gospel, we may next appeal to primitive antiquity, either for information in regard to things indifferent, or illustration of things not clearly revealed. We must suffer the Saints of the first ages to declare 'what form of doctrine had been delivered unto them;' what was generally believed and practised in their day; and the natural presumption will be, that this belief and this practice were derived from the Apostles. Their testimony to facts we deem it reasonable to receive; their opinions we would test with caution. The first rests upon the basis of their unimpeached honesty, and actual observation, and, consequently, may not be consistently rejected; the latter may be erroneous, for they themselves were not infallible. Thus then, brethren, would we arrive at a knowledge of the faith of the Gospel, by a reference to Scripture as the standard of doctrine; to primitive antiquity as a model of practice. With us, the Bible is authoritative; and other evidence admitted is but collateral or confirmatory. This, brethren, is the ground assumed by the Church of which we are members, and it is precisely that high and vantage ground, on which she can be safe from the assumptions of Papal power on the one hand, and the fury of untempered innovation on the other. Let then, the Church be the witness and keeper of Holy Writ; for so hath God ordained. Let her have authority to judge and determine in controversies of faith; not that absolute authority which is predicated on the claim of infallibility, not that authority which would fetter the minds and consciences of her members; yea, fetter the word of God; but that authority, which, resting upon the possession of concentrated wisdom and piety, and upon the peculiar benediction of her Divine founder and head, is all that she arrogates to herself, inducing her not 'to go beyond the word of the Lord, to do either less or more.' Give to her less than this, and you make her a mere nullity; give to her more than this, and you then make the Bible the mere creature of her will: you magnify the ark itself above the law and the testimony, which it only enshrines. Scripture, then, in connection with the testimony of the first ages, having guided us, to what we, as a body, deem the faith of the Gospel, the faith, as it 'once was delivered to the Saints,' the question next occurs, whether we are to strive for this very faith, and it only, in opposition to any other modifications of it? In other words, whether the obligation

we are under, to contend for the faith of the Gospel, generally, should constrain us to contend particularly, also, for each one of its doctrines? Unhesitatingly we answer, that it should. And for this reply, we urge the plainest considerations of necessity and duty.

"Proceeding on the principle, that it is commendable to strive for the Gospel as a whole, but to be indifferent to its specific doctrines; and it is no improbable supposition, brethren, considering the proneness of man to novelty, that if we strove at all, it would be for something in which there was not one feature of the original Gospel left. If you strive not for the integrity of the parts, what, my brethern, is to become of the whole? Let each attack that doctrine or duty which is exceptionable in his eyes; and what part of the body of doctrine will not be wounded? Let one level the doctrine of the Saviour's Deity; another, that of his atonement; another, that of the influence of the Spirit; another, that of our present depravity; another, the justice and impartiality of God; another, the fact that the Church is a divinely constituted body, the ministry and ordinances of which owe their efficiency solely to the appointment of Christ. Stand by, calm spectators, while different enemies thus take fortress after fortress, suspending your efforts because in each case it is only a part and not the whole of the Gospel that is assailed; and assuredly, brethren, your spiritual weapons will not be brought into exercise, until there is nothing left for them to protect, or defend. No, brethren, it becomes us not thus to act. All doctrines or duties may not possess precisely the same importance, but it is dangerous to prefer one thing to another; to dwell upon the distinction between greater and minor points in Christianity. All its truths are sacred. Each one of them is worthy of notice and of maintenance. For each one of them are we bound to strive. The popular voice may condemn all attachment to the peculiarities of system; but, he, who, unconvinced would sacrifice at the shrine of popularity, one doctrine, or one view of doctrine honestly held, might well be expected to sacrifice more, if not all, at the same shrine. If he is not faithful 'over few things,' how shall he be faithful over 'many things?' My brethren, if we would not go all lengths in seeming liberality, until it terminates in indifference, or absolute infidelity, we must firmly maintain even the smallest known truth; we must strive for every 'jot and tittle' of the Gospel."

In the first part of this, Reverend Sir, I understand you to mean that they who believe generally in the truth of the Christian Revelation, but differ from each other as to what are many of the peculiar doctrines of that revelation, ought each to contend in his own way, that God revealed the Christian system; that when they meet, they will have to settle

between themselves much of what that system is:—because, in truth, their differences are very numerous. Next, however, you inform us, that they all agree that whatever the system may be, it is to be found in the Bible: but when asked what doctrine the Bible contains, again they unfortunately have a conflict of opinions. You next approach to a solution of the difficulty, by saying, that the Bible must be interpreted by enlightened reason, and you complain of the evils which have been caused by neglecting this mode of interpretation; but you avow that under no circumstances could it be expected that all persons should agree as to what are all the peculiar doctrines contained in this book; and you say that as Popery teaches, that by receiving the authorized interpretation of the Bible from the Church, there would be an end to this conflict of opinions respecting the peculiar doctrine which God has revealed; we must never be driven back to this main error. You say the 20th Article of your Church protests against this main error of Popery. That is, Reverend Sir, you say it is a main error, to assert "that the Church is the authorized interpreter of the Scriptures"—and that your article protests against the same. I would feel happy, for many reasons, at your avowing that your last assertion was hasty and inconsiderate, because obviously, the article as quoted by you does not protest against, nor in any way contradict, the error as described by you; and it should be very well to allow it to be supposed that you did not know the force of your own articles, though you might be excused from knowing the meaning of mine.

Scripture, (which even with the aid of enlightened reason you said was insufficient to give full information as to the peculiar doctrines which God had revealed,) being the first witness, we may now, you say, appeal to primitive antiquity, to be informed concerning indifferent things—and to have illustration of what was not clearly revealed. The Saints are competent to inform us what doctrine they received and knew to exist. You distinguish between their testimony of facts, which you deem it reasonable to receive, and their opinions, which you test cautiously. The Bible is authority—other evidence is only collateral or confirmatory.

The Church is the witness and keeper of the Scripture, having authority to judge and determine in controversies of faith; but not authority founded upon infallibility—not authority to fetter minds and consciences. [The authority which it has is] authority to give the word of God and not to give more, nor to give less.

We are bound to keep all the doctrines of God, for all truths are sacred—it is dangerous to make distinctions between greater and minor

points of Christianity—we are bound to strive for them all—we must firmly maintain the smallest known truth—we must strive for every jot and tittle of the Gospel.

Such, Reverend Sir, are your assertions. I have been tedious, but it was necessary. The more I reflect upon your mass of contradictions, the more I am at a loss to know what could have led you unnecessarily in the maze of your perplexity to lay so lustily upon Popery, unless it was yielding to a disposition which is very common, when we find ourselves disappointed, [under the influence of which] we feel an inclination to quarrel with those who have been more fortunate than ourselves. Perhaps, Sir, you do not yet believe that you have been palpably contradicting yourself. I shall, in my next, aid you to see it very clearly.

Yours, and so forth,

A Roman Catholic.

LETTER II.

Charleston, S. C., July 31, 1826.

To the Rev. Hugh Smith, A.M.

Rev. Sir,—The System of Christianity is nothing but the collection of the doctrines which Christ has taught to man; this collection of doctrines is the object of man's belief; the foundations of that belief are the truth and authority of Christ. Knowing that he can neither be himself deceived, nor deceive those to whom he speaks, man is perfectly certain that whatsoever Christ has declared must be infallibly and unchangeably true; there can be no possibility of error, and time cannot change the essence of truth. Knowing that Christ has authority to require his belief of what is in itself true, and has been proposed by the Creator to the creature for his belief, man feels that it is his duty to receive this truth so made manifest, or revealed to him. This dutiful belief is faith. Faith, then, is not founded upon the mere discoveries of unaided reason, but upon the authoritative declarations of God. But faith cannot contradict reason: for God, who is the source of truth, cannot contradict by revelation what he teaches us by our reason,—the usual aid which he has bestowed on us for the discovery of truth. We, however, know by daily experience that our reason is very imperfect; and it is a self-evident maxim, that God's reason is perfect: hence, when man has the testimony of the perfect reason of God on one side, and the imperfection of his own opinions on the other side, the plain dictate of wisdom teaches him which deserves the preference.

The perfect reason of God, to which man's opinion should yield,

can and does reach to the knowledge of many plain but sublime truths, to which our imperfect minds not only could not reach, but which to us would appear altogether impossible. You will agree with me Reverend Sir, in looking upon God's own eternity, his immensity, his simplicity, his unity, his trinity, and a variety of his attributes in this light. I will not presume to assert that your expanded mind cannot conceive them; but, I assure you, Reverend Sir, that mine does not; neither have I ever yet had the good fortune to meet with any person who admitted that he could comprehend any one of them, much less the whole; nor is the Unitarian one whit more fortunate in this respect than I am; for, if he can understand the nature of the eternal and self-existent Being in whom he believes, he certainly is more highly gifted than is your correspondent. Nor is the mathematician exempt from the difficulty, for it meets him in a thousand shapes, and in a multitude of cases. I shall instance only one amongst the most obvious. He believes that two lines can be continued to infinity, that those lines are perpetually approximating, and that, continued to eternity in this approximation, they will never meet; this he demonstrates most clearly, fully, and satisfactorily. Still, Reverend Sir, how many persons would exclaim that it is the assertion of a palpable absurdity.

I suppose, then, that we are agreed upon the admission, that the reason of Christ is perfect, and that of man imperfect; that, in consequence, since Christ has authority to teach, it is man's duty to believe his revelation; though the truth which he teaches not only surpasses man's reason, but even frequently appears to imperfect human beings to be an impossibility, perhaps an absurdity. Thus, you will, I trust, agree in my conclusion, that, when man knows that Christ teaches, it is his duty to believe the doctrine, without waiting to examine whether what the Saviour has so taught, will be approved of by man's own reason; because, if man was free to reject the doctrine, unless it was sanctioned by his own reason, the office of Christ would not be that of a teacher, but of a propounder; and man would be placed over Christ, as the judge who was to decide whether what the Saviour propounded, was true; so that man would, in fact, believe doctrines solely upon the authority of his own reason, and not upon the authority of his revealing teacher; and, in this case, it would be an absurdity for man to believe any mystery. In this case, there could be no fault.

Faith is, then, the belief upon the authority of God, of what reason cannot by its own force discover. Christian faith, or the faith of the Gospel, is the belief upon the authority of Chirst, of all that he has revealed. You, Reverend Sir, very properly reject upon this principle,

the distinction between greater and minor points of Christianity. By points, I suppose you mean doctrines. You very properly say—"If we would not go all lengths in seeming liberality, until it terminates in indifference, or absolute infidelity, we must firmly maintain even the smallest known truth; we must strive for every 'jot and tittle' of the Gospel." And, Reverend Sir, for this you give a very excellent reason: "All its truths are sacred," i. e. they have been revealed by Christ; for, Reverend Sir, if there be in that Gospel any thing not revealed by him, it must have been an interpolation; and if there is an interpolation which I cannot with infallible certainty separate from what is genuine, I cannot be infallibly certain which part is genuine, and if I cannot be infallibly certain what part is genuine, I cannot by the Gospel have certain evidence of what Christ has taught; and, if I cannot have certain evidence of what Christ has taught, I am no longer bound to believe any doctrine as revealed by Christ. In this case, there is an end to Christianity. To assert that I would be bound in such a case, would be to assert that a man is bound to believe what he has neither the certain evidence of God, or of his own reason to believe. Hence, Reverend Sir, I agree fully in your conclusion; and say, that Christian faith consists in believing the whole and every part of what has been revealed by Christ; and thus the "faith once delivered to the saints" evidently consists in the [summary of] doctrines delivered by Christ, to be by them believed and transmitted to after ages. And the abandonment of one "jot or tittle" thereof, necessarily leads to infidelity; because it destroys the principle that our belief must be upon the authority of our teacher, and not according to our own choice. Upon this, you remark very well:

"If you strive not for the integrity of the parts, what, my brethren, is to become of the whole? Let each attack that doctrine or duty, which is exceptionable in his eyes, and what part of the body of doctrine will not be wounded? Let one level the doctrine of the Saviour's Deity; another that of his atonement; another that of the influence of the Spirit; another that of our present depravity; another, the justice and impartiality of God; another, the fact that the Church is a divinely constituted body, the ministry and ordinances of which owe their efficacy solely to the appointment of Christ. Stand by calm spectators while different enemies thus take fortress after fortress, suspending your efforts because in such case it is only a part and not the whole of the Gospel that is assailed; and assuredly, brethren, your spiritual weapons will not be brought into exercise, until there is nothing left for them to protect or defend. No, brethren, it becomes us not thus to act. All doctrines and duties may not possess precisely the same importance, but it is dangerous

to prefer one thing to another; to dwell upon the distinction between greater and minor points in Christianity. All its truths are sacred. Each one of them is worthy of notice and of maintenance. For each one of them are we bound to strive."

And thus you very fully and forcibly prove, by exemplification to which daily experience, adds melancholy confirmation of truth, the correctness of your leading assertion, viz:

"Proceeding on the principle, that it is commendable to strive for the Gospel as a whole, but to be indifferent to its specific doctrines; and it is no improbable supposition, brethren, considering the proneness of man to novelty, that if we strive at all, it would be for something in which there was not one feature of the original Gospel left."

You did then, Reverend Sir, "urge the plainest considerations of necessity and duty" to support your reply to your query:

"Whether we are to strive for this very faith, and it only, in opposition to any other modifications of it? In other words, whether the obligation we are under to contend for the faith of the Gospel, generally, should constrain us to contend particularly also for each one of its doctrines? Unhesitatingly we answer that it should. And for this reply, we urge the plainest considerations of necessity and duty."

Now, Reverend Sir, the sum of our reasoning amounts to this: Christian faith is the belief upon the authority of Christ, of all the doctrines which he has revealed. The essence of faith consists in the principle that we must believe upon the authority of Christ; and as his authority is equally great in the revelation of any one doctrine as of another, faith cannot admit any distinction between his doctrines, because the admission of any such distinction would be the rejection of his authority, as far as that doctrine which we undervalue is concerned; and if we undervalue his authority in any one point, we destroy it altogether; for if in any, even the least point, Christ could deceive us or be himself deceived, the same could occur in a variety of other cases, and we could have no certainty from the testimony of our Saviour of the truth of any doctrine revealed by him. To escape this blasphemous alternative, we assert, with good reason, that as he neither is capable of deceit, or liable to be deceived, his testimony in all things, great and small, is the testimony of Infallible Truth; and that man is bound to believe every one of his doctrines, and that Christian faith consists in believing them all. This result of reason and basis of religion, Reverend Sir, is the only principle of the Roman Catholic Church. How then does it happen that we differ so very widely in its application to practice, if you and I are agreed as to its truth? I assume that one of the causes

of our difference arose from your frequently contradicting the principle itself; whilst I adhere to a Church which has never deviated from its letter or spirit. Allow me to shew you how you have done so in some instances in this same sermon. The very commencement of the extract which I made in my former letter furnishes me with a palpable instance of this description.

"Thus, then, it appears, that there has been but one sentiment in the Christian world, as to the duty of 'contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints,' when that faith was assailed; and that, in reference to this general defence, those who differ from each other on minor points, may and ought 'to strive together.'

Now, Reverend Sir, we agreed, that no distinction "between greater and minor points in Christianity" could be allowed without the destruction of the principle of faith, or "absolute infidelity," yet here, you not only allow the distinction, but you assure us that "those who differ from each other on minor points may and ought to strive together" in defence of what their difference destroys. To your erudition, Reverend Sir, I consign the reconciliation of your own assertions.

According to our former view of Christian faith, it was the belief of all the doctrines which Christ revealed. It is manifest that truth is in unison with truth: Christ could reveal only truth: his revelation must then have all its parts in perfect union; they must coalesce into one consistent system. His revelation was the teaching us facts or doctrines which could not admit of different views. The fact cannot be changed by any view, the doctrine must under every view be the same doctrine. From the first quotation I make from you in this letter, it is clear that you could not admit any part of his revelation to be rejected,—from the second it is plain that you do not admit any specific doctrine to be a matter of indifference. And from common reason you must say the God of truth must give a system of revelation in union with itself, all the parts [of which] are in union with each other. I believe you will find all those positions contradicted in your following passage, which is the sequel of that which I have above taken.

"Not, however, that union or coalition, which from the infirmity of our nature, and from a warm attachment to different views, never can exist; that union, which, forced and almost unnatural, instead of tending to harmony, too frequently ministers to strife; not by being 'unequally yoked together' by a yoke that will prove galling to both."

Because here you say it is impossible for those who strive together for the truth of the Christian system, to be in union or coalition: you say they must be "warmly attached to different views" of the same facts

or doctrines. I assure you, Sir, that I cannot reconcile you to yourself.

View calmly your next passage.

"No, not thus, brethren, are they who believe in Christianity but differ as to its peculiarities; not thus are they to strive together; but by marching in separate columns to the defence of the truth, by separately directing their efforts to one and the same point, and causing them to meet in the same centre; thus, securing the benefits of combined exertion while they avoid the dangers of collision."

Pray, Reverend Sir, if there exists a belief of all that Christ has taught; if there be no distinction admissible between greater and minor point; in what will consist the difference as to the peculiarities of what he taught? How can they strive together who differ as to the object for which they strive? Different divisions have different systems of doctrine, which systems are contradictory, and they have been divided because of the incompatibility of their contradictory systems:—the establishment of one system inevitably destroys what that system contradicts. How can you make two contradictory propositions be true together? Sir, when you marshalled your columns upon the circumference, and gave the command to march upon the centre, you indeed were a thoughtless general, or you intended a merciless carnage; because each division was armed against the other. For instance, you say that Christ established Episcopal government in the Church, and that Presbyterial ordination is invalid. The leader of a Presbyterian column denies that Christ taught either of those propositions, but asserts that he taught the necessity and validity of infant baptism. The leader of another of your columns denies that he taught either the necessity or the validity of this baptism, but assures us that Christ taught that he was God—co-equal with his Father. The Unitarian assures us that this is a mistake, for that if we examine the Bible, with the aid of enlightened reason, we shall be convinced that this contradicts the doctrine of the Saviour. My leader declares that St. Peter was constituted head of the Church by the Redeemer, who taught that we should all be one visible body on earth under one visible head, and all believing in the same doctrines, which are all those, and only those, which Christ has taught. We are assailed on every side, and called idolaters and full of error. We are told, even by you, Reverend Sir, that a difference upon minor points is not only allowable but unavoidable—though you assured us that this difference, if allowed, would be destructive of Christianity; as I verily believe it would. And now, Reverend Sir, having left your columns striving together in a not very enviable state, I leave you to make peace between them if you can, without having recourse to one of two modes. Either admit the

distinction between greater and minor points of faith, and you [will] destroy Christianity; or, admit no such distinction, and be consistent in reducing your principles to practice, and you will infallibly become a Roman Catholic. I am aware the state in which this places you is not the most enviable; but, Reverend Sir, you would have been spared from this, had you, at Macon, left untouched that main error of Popery, which alone can save you from scepticism and doubt. I remain, Reverend Sir, yours, and so forth,

A Roman Catholic.

LETTER III.

Charleston, S. C., Aug. 7, 1826.

To the Rev. Hugh Smith, A.M.

Rev. Sir,—In my second letter, I showed that you asserted that Christian faith requires of us firmly to maintain even the smallest known truth; that we must strive for every "jot and tittle" of the Gospel; and that you also assert, that they who differed as to the peculiarities, that is the peculiar truths of the Gospel, who were warmly attached to different views of the same revelation, who differed from each other on minor points, were bound by duty to contend earnestly for the "faith once delivered to the saints;" although in doing so there was not one of them who, in the estimation of the rest, did not omit striving for many jots and several tittles of the Gospel—and who, in the opinion of his fellows, did not in several instances contradict that Gospel. I leave to yourself the task of reconciling those assertions. Perhaps you have succeeded in so doing. You will, therefore, have leisure for much similar employment.

In the second paragraph which I quote from you, is the following:—

"There is a general coincidence then, brethren, as to what is the faith of the Gospel, viz: the Revelation of God contained in the Bible; and for this faith, it is admitted, that all should, in a certain sense, strive together. But when we leave this general ground; when we ask what the 'faith of the Gospel' is, in all its parts, coincidence of sentiment is at an end, and many contradictory replies meet our ear. How, then, are we to choose amidst all those conflicting opinions of men? How is this faith of the Gospel to be more minutely ascertained?"

With your own expressions then, Reverend Sir, you confirm the concluding assertion of my second letter—that those who strive together according to you, are in truth and in fact, not one body professing the same doctrine, but several sects holding contradictory opinions. And

who besides yourself, Reverend Sir, would expect to produce a consistent system of revelation, merely from the declarations of those who teach contradictions? You who tell us, "Let each attack that doctrine or duty which is exceptionable in his eyes, and what part of the body of doctrine will not be wounded?" Thus, you support the Christian system upon a plan which wounds every portion of the Christian doctrine! ! !

We now proceed, Reverend Sir, to a new topic. Here you tell us with Chillingworth, that the Bible is the Religion of Protestants. Now Sir, with all deference to Mr. Chillingworth and to you, I will, on behalf of Protestants, protest against this proposition. Religion, Reverend Sir, is a disposition of the soul, and not a book. What would be thought of me if I asserted, because a profligate blasphemer and robber kept a Bible always in his pocket, that he was a man who always possessed and carried the Protestant religion about with him. No, Sir, I will not so far libel my Protestant fellow-citizens, as to say that their religion is not an interior disposition of the soul. I have often heard and still believe that it is criminal for a man to sell his religion, or to give it away. But, if Mr. Chillingworth and you are correct, the Protestant religion is hourly bought and sold, and given away by the very best Protestants. What dreadful crimes have not the Bible Societies to answer for, if Mr. Chillingworth and you be correct? Religion, Reverend Sir, is obedience to God; whosoever has the sincere disposition to obey him is religious, whether he has a Bible or not; whether he profess to be a Protestant or not. Your sixth article does not say that the Bible is the Protestant Religion; but it asserts one fact, and draws one consequence—and if the fact be stated correctly, the consequence which is well and logically drawn must also be true, and the whole article be a sound principle for religion. It asserts, that all which God made necessary for man to know, in order to be saved, is to be found in the Bible; and concludes therefore, [that] no man is to be required to believe any doctrine which is not found in the Bible, or may not be proved from the Bible; nor to do any thing, as necessary to salvation, unless it is so found or so proved. This certainly states, that all the principles of religious doctrine and of religious practice, are to be found in that book; but it does not assert, that that book itself is the disposition to believe those doctrines, and to practice those duties; and if it did make such an assertion, it would be the assertion of an absurdity, viz. that a book was a disposition of the soul.

But, Reverend Sir, you and your article have been a little too hasty; because you both forget to tell us how we are to know either that any thing contained in the Bible was revealed by God, or that all

which he revealed was contained in the original Bible; or that the original Bible has come down to us; if it did, which of the different kinds of books called Bibles is that which came from God: because there is not one of those topics upon which we have intuitive evidence. For my own part, I assure you I can at any moment you think proper, exhibit to you some very serious difficulties upon each of those heads, all of which, and many more you have, it seems, forgotten. But, Reverend Sir, a difficulty does not vanish, because the Reverend Hugh Smith thinks proper to overlook it: nor is it destroyed for not having been removed by the compilers of the sixth article of his Church. Let us, Reverend Sir, in imagination, clear all those difficulties. I take up any Bible you please, and I assent to your proposition—that this identical book contains all that God has taught, and only what God has taught: I shall allow you in this case to speak for yourself.

"You may ask, however, 'are there not many who appeal to this standard, equally honest in purpose, and equally earnest in seeking, and who return from its perusal with widely different impressions? Does not every Christian sect profess to hold the pure "faith of the Gospel," and to have derived its doctrinal compend, or digest, from the Bible?' It is indeed so, brethren: Nor should this fact excite our surprise, or drive us from that most safe position, that to the Bible must be our first appeal."

Thus, Reverend Sir, the Bible alone is insufficient to bring man to a certain knowledge of what God has taught; because equally honest men return from its perusal with widely different impressions; that is, as you said before, "coincidence of sentiment is at an end, and many contradictory replies meet our ear." Alas for us then! Reverend Sir! so, after the mighty mound of difficulties which we have cleared in a bound and left behind us, we have not from the Bible alone, that is from Mr. Chillingworth's Protestant religion, any certainty of what God has taught; and yet this is what you call a most safe position: viz. "Truth is in this book, but I cannot find it without aid besides the book." Are all those contradictory replies of honest men truths of Christianity? Is the Christian Faith in contradiction to itself? But the Reverend Hugh Smith cannot say so. The Bible alone will not suffice; enlightened reason must be added. This will draw out the truth which was always in the book, but which lies hidden until enlightened reason discovers it.

"But be it remembered, that it must be the Bible interpreted by enlightened reason; by the comparison of its several parts with each other; and in entire subserviency to the unquestionable axiom, that a revelation from God, cannot contain any thing that will impugn his known

attributes, or detract from his infinite perfections. Had it been always thus interpreted, notwithstanding the varieties in the structure of the human mind, the Christian world would not have been called to witness so many divisions, and subdivisions, modifications and re-modifications of doctrinal incorrectness. Nor would the Bible itself have been insulted by being given as the authority for so much that is absurd in theory, or demoralizing in practical tendency."

This is very well, if I could know what was meant by enlightened reason, and discover where it was to be found. If every human being has it, then the Bible alone being given to each individual will suffice, because he has enlightened reason, and we shall have no contradictions: and the principle of the indiscriminate distribution of the sacred volume, is one of the best and most salutary which ever was recognized. But since you have informed us that the Bible has not been always interpreted by enlightened reason, it is clear that it is not universally possessed: it becomes necessary to know where enlightened reason is to be found, because where that and the Bible are conjoined, I shall find with certainty the doctrine of the Christian faith; where it is not, though the Bible should be there, I am likely to get only absurd theory, and what is demoralizing in practical tendency, "and modifications and re-modifications of doctrinal incorrectness." Do, pray, good Sir, inform me where this enlightened reason is to be found, that I may use its aid. But that you may at once see my difficulty, I shall make a short statement of my case.

In this city, many persons whom I very highly respect, say that Bishop Bowen and his clergy are gentlemen of enlightened reason; I myself esteem them highly; I have equal esteem for the enlightened reason of Bishop England and his clergy: there are many highly enlightened, reasonable Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Lutheran, Baptist and Methodist clergymen in this city: no one claims to be more closely guided by enlightened reason, in the explanation of the sacred volume, than does the gifted and tasteful pastor of the Unitarians. Yet, all of those, having the Bible and enlightened reason, and comparing the several parts with each other, and holding to the maxim which you lay down, are perpetually contradicting each other. Thus, Reverend Sir, I fear your remedy of helping the Bible with enlightened reason is no remedy. And indeed in the very next passage you appear to me to say so yourself.

"Perfect uniformity of sentiment, even were all the circumstances of spiritual preparation, and of biblical investigation, equal, could scarcely be expected. Nor is this more surprising than that God has

permitted men to receive different impressions from the same sounds, the same views, the same subjects."

So, Reverend Sir, we are to hold to this most safe position, from which we are never to be driven; "that to the Bible must be our first appeal." But the appellants are clamorous in their contradictions, all drawn from the Bible: you say—"call in enlightened reason to interpret the Bible." I have called in several, who said they had it, and that their interpretations were all made by it, and the Babel of their contradiction is worse than ever. You now tell me "you cannot expect perfect uniformity of sentiment, you must not be surprised at it any more than you are surprised that men receive different impressions from the same sounds." Why, Reverend Sir, I thought that all men called sweet sound, sweet sound, and that any person who called discord, concord, would be said to have miscalled it: for it will be concord, though he should call it discord; nor do I believe Reverend Sir, that you could persuade your congregation, that the mingled sounds which assailed the ears of Hogarth's enraged musician, would be an exquisite oratorio. I am sorry for your own sake, that you should adduce a comparison, which so completely destroys your own theory. But to return, Reverend Sir, I do think it will be thought surprising that you should assert, that if the Bible had always been interpreted by enlightened reason, the Christian world would not have been called upon to witness so many divisions and subdivisions, modifications and re-modifications of doctrinal incorrectness; nor would the Bible itself be insulted, by being given as the authority for so much that is absurd in theory, and so forth. And, in the very next line to tell us, that with all the help of enlightened reason, we must expect contradictions; for such is the true meaning of your phrase; however, softened in expression, it means doctrinal incorrectness. How many "jots and tittles" of the Gospel will be lost in this jargon of sounds—in those different views of the same subject! We found, that there could not be two views: for either God revealed the doctrine, and then it is true, or he did not reveal it, and then we are not bound to believe it—so that this is not a subject of opinion, but a matter of fact, which does not admit any difference of view. Thus, Reverend Sir, enlightened reason is a phrase, which here has no meaning, it is a delusive sound, which misleads; and after much wandering, leaves us where we originally were, in perfect uncertainty as to what is the doctrine of Jesus Christ: we have indeed expressions in a book, but no agreement as to their meaning.

As you may observe, Reverend Sir, I am now drawing near that part where you dealt me the unprovoked blow. I shall therefore con-

clude for this day, leaving to my next to parry it as well as I can; meantime allow me to remind you of our progress. You have told us, that faith admits of no distinction of greater and minor doctrines, and yet you admitted the distinction. You told us that any man who contended for only some of the doctrines of Christ, to the exclusion of others, established a principle which would lead to absolute infidelity, yet you brought forward those who thus contended, to be the destroyers of infidelity. You told us, that whoever did not strive for every jot and tittle of the Gospel, did not act according to the obligation under which we are, to contend for the faith of the Gospel generally; yet you placed in this field of contention, striving together, all the sects which differed, by striving for and against those jots and tittles. You told us, the Protestant religion was the Bible; yet you told us the Bible alone, and consequently the Protestant religion alone, would never bring us to the certain knowledge of Christ's doctrine. You said, that well disposed persons having all this Bible, that is, all the Protestant religion, would still be replying in contradictions, when asked, what was the faith of the Gospel. You said, enlightened reason and its accompaniments interpreting the Bible, would save us from divisions, and so forth; yet you told us, that with all those aids, you could not expect uniformity of sentiment, as to what was the true doctrine of Christ. You perceive, that amongst Protestants this doctrinal union does not exist, cannot exist. But you tell us, we must not take up the principles of the Popish Church, which has secured this uniformity, though you must acknowledge the doctrine of Christ is not contradictory, but is uniform.

I cannot aid you to reconcile these assertions, but I shall exhibit to you some others of the same description, which are to be found in your sermon. And I remain, Reverend Sir, yours, and so forth,

A Roman Catholic.

LETTER IV.

Charleslon, S. C., Aug. 14, 1826.

To the Rev. Hugh Smith, A.M.

Rev. Sir—I may now assume, as fairly proved, that you admit Scripture alone will not be a sufficient guide to us in ascertaining what is the Christian doctrine. Neither will Scripture, when interpreted by enlightened reason, for you will not, Reverend Sir, I suppose, assert that the Reverend Mr. Swiney, the Reverend Mr. Moderwell, the Reverend Mr. Whitaker, and the respectable gentlemen who are your confreres in the ministry of the word, they for instance, who now communicate in

the Baptist and Methodist Churches of Augusta, the faith once delivered to the Saints, are all bereft of enlightened reason. How, then, are we to know the Christian doctrine? In your own words: "How is the faith of the Gospel to be more minutely ascertained?" Indeed, Reverend Sir, this is the only material question in all religious controversy: and a question towards the solving of which you have not, so far as we have yet got through your sermon, made a single step. However, you acknowledge, that although we cannot ascertain with certainty what the doctrine of Christ is; for this is the only construction which can suit your expression, "Want of uniformity in the inferences honestly drawn from Scripture," yet this "must never drive us back to that main pillar and main error of Popery, that the Church is the authorized interpreter of Scripture." Now, Reverend Sir, all other modes latterly substituted having utterly failed, and this old mode plainly having succeeded in preserving, through so many ages and nations, and uniformity of doctrine, which is of the essence of faith, I am at a loss to know why you should have so dogmatically rejected it.

The only reason you can give, is indeed apparently a very Popish one: "The Church of which we are members, has entered her own protest against it." Which means: "you are not to have recourse to this mode, because the Church of which you are members, protests that you should not." If you gave any other reason, I have not seen it; it is omitted in your printed sermon. Reverend Sir, I leave to you to reconcile these two propositions, which are your own, "You must not believe that the Church is the authorized interpreter of the Scriptures." "You must not look for the meaning of the Scriptures in any way against which your Church protests." Not only are your two assertions perfectly in opposition to each other, but the last is the most arbitrary and despotic in its principle, of any that ever fell under my observation. It is as unlike the principle of the Catholic Church, of which Protestants complain, as any principle can be unlike another. I shall exhibit both. *Catholic principle*: God has constituted the Church a tribunal, to give with authority the true interpretation of the Scriptures; therefore, you ought to receive her interpretation, in order to pay due homage to him who created and gave power to the tribunal. *Reverend Hugh Smith's principle;* God has not constituted the Church a tribunal, to give with authority the true interpretation of the Scriptures; nevertheless, you must not have recourse for their interpretation to a mode against which she protests. Despotism, or arbitrary rule, Reverend Sir, is using power which has not been properly and sufficiently granted, and he who says, that "he will use that power, although he believes it has

not been granted,'' is, in grain and constitution, knowingly and willingly an arbitrary despot in the fullest meaning of the word; not so the man who uses a power which he conscientiously believes has been properly derived to him, from a competent source: though he might err as to the fact, he is not a despot, he is not arbitrary, when he uses it only because he believes he is empowered, but is not disposed to use it, if he should discover that such power had not been granted. Need I make any application of the facts to the principles, to prove that you must either assert, that your Church is divinely authorized to give with infallible certainty the true interpretation of the Scriptures, or that her assuming to do, what she says, is not in her grant from Heaven, viz. to give us with precision and certainty the true interpretation of the Scriptures, and thus the knowledge of what Christ taught in articles of belief; is an arbitrary, despotic and tyrannical usurpation? Those expressions, Reverend Sir, are not applied to the individual members of your church; they are applied as the natural and inevitable results of your assertions; they are applied to the system which you would establish: a system not only in direct opposition to the first principles of the Christian religion; but moreover fitted to excite disgust and indignaton amongst a people who, being justly jealous of their rights and liberty, are not disposed to admit the exercise of any power except what is evidently derived from their God, or from themselves.

I have assumed, Reverend Sir, that your Church did protest against what you stated to ''be the main pillar and the main error of Popery.'' But is the fact so? Let us examine your ground for the assertion. The error you say is, ''that the Church is the authorized interpreter of Scripture.'' I shall not here compare yourself with yourself, that *bon bouche,* I shall reserve; but I will compare your assertion with your proof—

''And the want of this uniformity in the inferences, honestly drawn from the Scripture, must never drive us back to that main pillar, and main error of Popery, that the Church is the authorized interpreter of Scripture. Against this, the Church of which we are members, has entered her own protest; declaring in her 20th article, 'It is not lawful for the Church to decree any thing contrary to God's word written; neither may it so explain one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so, beside the same, ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.' ''

Now, the 20th article, as given by you, consists of several propositions, not one of which contradicts that which you called ''the main

error of Popery." It says 1st, "It is not lawful for the Church to decree any thing contrary to God's word written." I, a firm Papist, as you would probably have the politeness to call me, not only do believe this proposition to be true as here given, but even more than this, I would strike out the word written, or I would add the words, or unwritten, and thus extending the proposition, I would uphold it. 2d, "Neither may the Church so explain one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another." Granted. 3d, "Although the Church is a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, it ought not to decree any thing against the same." Granted. The wherefore, shows this to be a conclusion drawn from the first two propositions. I allow the truth of the premises, and the accuracy and the truth of the conclusion. 4th, "The Church ought not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation, beside the Holy Writ." From this proposition I dissent for sufficient reasons. But now I do not give them, for the only question is—which of those four propositions denies the assertion, "that the Church is the authorized interpreter of Scripture?" How could you, Reverend Sir, have so far committed yourself, as to draw a conclusion not contained in your premises, as this evidently is not? Nay, I go farther, and say, that the three first propositions evidently imply the power of this authorized interpretation to be in the Church; so that you have been doubly unfortunate, for you have not shown that your Church protests against this error of Popery, and you have produced an article, which you assert does what it does not, viz: protests against this error, and which, moreover, actually supposes what you call error, to be the practice of your Church, and only gives rules for regulating that practice. It does not assert, that the Church is not authorized to interpret the Scripture, but says, she is not authorized to interpret it absurdly, nor to teach any thing as necessary for faith, besides its contents: thus your Church rescues herself in a great measure from that charge of despotism and tyranny which you would, in your zeal against Papists, so thoughtlessly fasten upon your own respectable society.

I would here, disclaiming all "intention of disrespect or obtrusion, ask you, Reverend Sir, whether your own practice is not in opposition to the principle which you lay down." I know you are an officiating clergyman, who preach the interpretation of the Scriptures to your congregation; whence, I would ask you, as an Episcopalian, do you derive authority to give this public interpretation? Is it not from your Church, through the bishop who gave you ordination? Did the Church then, through the bishop, give you a power which she had not herself? It is not a private, but a public fact, that you hold weekly meetings of pious

ladies, who, together with you, search the Scriptures, for the purpose of interpretation, and that your researches are generally directed to the most abstruse and difficult questions. Do they conceive that the opinion of each lady is equal in value to yours? Do you believe, that, if the most highly gifted amongst those ladies, was to discover, that "this is my body," means, "this is my body," you would consider she had equal authority so to interpret it to your congregation on the succeeding Sunday, as you would, to tell them, "this is my body," means, "this is not my body." How often, Reverend Sir, if report says truly, have you not been obliged to repress the zeal of some fair disputant, by the assurance, that if she persisted in her favorite interpretation, it would be "HERESY," because it was in opposition to the authorized interpretation of the Church? I have been assured, that this main error has frequently been your main pillar, to preserve you from being borne away to every side by the unsteady torrent of your impetuous, yet gentle, your docile, yet dogmatizing assailants and supporters. Your Church herself, Reverend Sir, disclaims not this power, for she judges what is heresy, and what is true doctrine, and therefore assumes to be an authorized interpreter of the Scriptures, so that she either must condemn her practice, or your assertion.

Thus baffled in discovering a rule, by which you will "minutely ascertain the faith of the Gospel," you proceed to make new assertions. "Scripture alone, is insufficient." How often has the Catholic been charged with blasphemy, and held up to execration by the English Church and the Bible Societies, for merely making this assertion, which now forms a basis of the system which you endeavor to defend? "Scripture, interpreted by enlightened reason, is not sufficient." But still "to the Bible must be our first appeal"—"this is a most safe position." You then proceed:

"Scripture, then, being our first witness as to the faith of the Gospel, we may next appeal to primitive antiquity, either for information in regard to things indifferent, or illustration of things not clearly revealed. We must suffer the Saints of the first ages to declare, 'What form of doctrine had been delivered unto them;' what was generally believed and practised in their day; and the natural presumption will be, that this belief, and this practice, were derived from the Apostles. Their testimony to facts, we deem it reasonable to receive; their opinions we would test with caution. The first rests upon the basis of their unimpeached honesty and actual observation, and consequently, may not be consistently rejected; the latter may be erroneous, for they themselves were not infallible. Thus then, brethren, would we arrive at a knowledge

of the faith of the Gospel, by a reference to Scripture, as the standard of doctrine; to primitive antiquity as a model of practice."

Now, Reverend Sir, I assert that your latter mode leaves us exactly where we were before you gave us this unmeaning passage. I call it unmeaning, and it is precisely, because it is so. I make the assertion, that we are still as far as ever from ascertaining the faith of the Gospel. In the first place, Scripture alone, that is what you here call our first witness, you already said was sufficient. You next appeal to primitive antiquity. Now I should like to know where this primitive antiquity is to be found—you appear to say it is to be found in the testimony of the Saints of the first ages. I am still at a loss—because you neither tell me to what period the first ages reach, nor who were the Saints. Thus you send me to witnesses of a very vague description, who live in time undefined. For instance, I appeal to the testimony of St. Augustine in the fifth age, who testifies to me that the doctrines of praying for the dead, and of offering up the holy sacrifice of the Mass were, in his day, received as derived from the Apostles. I deem it reasonable to receive this testimony as to facts. You deem it unreasonable. I appeal to the Scripture—you deny one of the books to be canonical, and you say I do not give a proper interpretation to the other. I bring the testimony of St. Augustine to uphold my position. How am I to know that he is a saint of the first ages? I can decide for myself. I say that you are at liberty to deny that he was a saint, or that the fifth was one of the first ages. Suppose you make either denial, how far have we got any mode of deciding our difference?—I see none. Therefore I call your passage vague, unmeaning, useless and deceptive, not that I charge you with intention of deceit. I believe you think your passage does convey precise ideas. Though I look upon you to have been very imprudent, Reverend Sir, I should be sorry to ascribe to you conduct unbecoming a gentleman or a Christian. But I must write as freely as you preach.

When you send me to primitive antiquity, then, you delude me with an empty name; when you tell me of the testimony of the saints of the early ages, you send me to a tribunal which is undefined. But I pass over this. Why shall I go to them? "Either for information in regard to things indifferent:"—Reverend Sir, I thought we agreed that though "all duties and doctrines may not possess precisely the same importance, it is dangerous to prefer one thing to another; to dwell upon the distinction between greater and minor points in Christianity. All its truths are sacred. Each one of them is worthy of notice, and of maintenance. For each one of them we are bound to strive. We must firmly maintain the smallest known truth; we must strive for every 'jot and tittle'

of the Gospel." Then, why call any part indifferent? We also are sent to the saints of the early ages for "illustration of things not clearly revealed." Am I awake, when I read this in the sermon of a Protestant clergyman? So then to use the phrase which has been so long flung at Popery, we are, by direction of the Reverend Hugh Smith, to go to the fallible tribunal of mortal man, for illustration of that infallible book which alone is to be the rule of our faith—and this because the book is not clear as to what God intends to teach! ! ! Hear this, all you who vituperate Papists, for saying that St. Peter was inspired when he wrote, that in St. Paul's Epistles are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest as they do the other Scriptures to their own destruction. Hear this, you who tell us that the Bible is plain to the meanest capacity! ! ! Why, good Sir, what would Mr. Chillingworth say to this? "The Bible, that is the Protestant religion, is not so clear as to God's revelation, but that it needs the illustration of the saints of the first ages, though we know of no authority which is to tell us exactly who are those saints, and which are those ages." Therefore we cannot know exactly what God has revealed in the Bible. Why, Reverend Sir, this is making the meaning of the Bible depend upon the interpretation of a tribunal, which cannot be ascertained, and which, if ascertained, would consist of poor miserable mortals. Is this the anti-popery? Is this the genuine Protestantism of the Reverend Hugh Smith, rector of St. Paul's, in Augusta?

From this we would imagine your plain theory was, that Scripture, either alone or with enlightened reason, being insufficient to lead us to ascertain minutely the faith of the Gospel, that is, the doctrines which it contains; that difficulty would be removed, and the doctrines would be ascertained by the aid of primitive authority, which would illustrate what was not clearly revealed in the Scriptures. The primitive antiquity was the testimony of the saints of the first ages, declaring "what form of doctrine had been delivered to them," what was generally believed and practised in their days; this belief or doctrine we naturally suppose to have come from the Apostles. The saints of the first ages would testify the fact, of what was given to them, the fact of what was generally believed: the force of this testimony rests upon their unimpeached honesty and actual observation; therefore, the testimony may not be consistently rejected. Such appeared to me to be your train of reasoning, and the only difficulty in my way then appeared to be, how I should know the saints and the times. I thought that here, at least, I should find you consistent with yourself, and that, if we could fix upon

the special witnesses, all our difficulties would be over. But, alas! I reckoned without my host. Because, after this mighty preparation, you again threw me back where I originally was. "Thus, then, brethren, would we arrive at a knowledge of the faith of the Gospel, by a reference to Scripture as a standard of doctrine; to primitive antiquity, as a model of practice." Thus, are we flung upon Scripture only for doctrine, after the fine display of its total inadequacy, without other aid, viz. the testimony of the saints, as to the facts, "what form of doctrine was given to them, what was generally believed in their day! ! !"

Reverend Sir, to speak with inoffensive candor, I believe you have no distinct notions upon the subject, and that your contradictions and inaccuracies arise from the peculiarity of your situation. Your society says, that the Scripture alone is the rule of faith. Adopting this principle, you can restrain no person from so interpreting the Scripture, as to produce what contradicts you. Then you call upon the saints to protect you, but you do not like to give them power to direct you, as your object is only that they should drive away your assailants.

Of course, Reverend Sir, you have read of the old man, who, tired of carrying his bundle of sticks, called upon death to release him; but when the king of terrors appeared, the old gentleman's courage failed, and he assured the grisly spectre, that he only asked his aid to place the bundle once more upon his shoulders. The saints would be excellent protectors against your friends the Reverend Doctor Whitaker or the Reverend Doctor Moderwell; but as soon as they cast a friendly glance of recognition at the Reverend Mr. Swiney, it is time to grant them leave of absence—Scripture alone is then sufficient.

You perceive, Reverend Sir, that our work thickens. But I must hasten to get through. Yours, and so forth,

A Roman Catholic.

LETTER V.

Charleston, S. C., Aug. 21, 1826.

To the Rev. Hugh Smith, A.M.

Rev. Sir—In my last I was obliged to conclude when I would have preferred to continue, but the regulation for my letter required its not exceeding a certain length. I shall therefore pursue the examination of the passage which I was considering. I shall, however, keep my promise of brevity, and discharge you with as much speed as I can.

You called upon the saints to illustrate those doctrines not clearly

revealed in the Bible: thus it is manifest, you allow that in the Bible there are doctrines not clearly revealed; you admitted this long before: viz. when you said enlightened reason was necessary for its interpretation: and when you said that equally honest men searching the same passage for the doctrine, contradicted each other; when you told us that with all the aids of reason, of spiritual preparation, and of biblical investigation, perfect uniformity of sentiment was not to be expected among those who studied the Bible. Thus nothing can be more evident than that you repeatedly asserted that the Bible alone, or even with those aids, was not sufficient to bring us to an uniformity of doctrine. Nothing is more evident on the other hand, than these two propositions: "Uniformity of doctrine is essential for faith." "The doctrine of Christ is perfectly uniform." The first of those propositions you have yourself maintained: "That the obligation we are under to contend for the faith of the Gospel, generally, should constrain us to contend particularly also for each one of its doctrines." The second is plain from the simple view that truth is uniform, and [that] Christ is truth. As then, Reverend Sir, you have established that the Scripture is not sufficiently clear to bring us to uniformity of sentiment, you have most fully established that it is an insufficient rule of faith; and that to be sufficient it needs some aid; and that [this] aid must be something more than enlightened reason. Now, as I come to the main error of Popery, to use your very kind and complimentary expression, I request you to watch my assertions closely.

It is admitted by you that an honest man fully qualified to investigate the Scriptures might, and that such men so doing every day, do find it impossible to agree as to what are the doctrines of the Gospel. Hence it is clear, that although the sacred volume does contain the law of God, and nothing but what is his law, and has all the authority of God himself; yet because of man's imperfection, though the book is authoritative, no man can be certain without some farther aid, that he can know the doctrines of God. Therefore unless farther aid than the Bible and enlightened reason is obtained, the doctrines which God requires of man to believe cannot be certainly known by man. A just God cannot require an impossibility from man; but it would be requiring an impossibility from him to insist that he should firmly believe doctrines whose truth he cannot discover, from that reason which God has given as his guide, or from revelation, which, though a sufficient motive of belief, if clear, is so obscure in the Bible, that honest and enlightened men cannot be certain, after their best investigation, what it teaches. Therefore a just God cannot require of man faith or the firm belief of

doctrines above his reason, and for the belief of which he has no certain knowledge from revelation, as given in the Bible.

This, Reverend Sir, is the difficulty, this the labyrinth, to extricate yourself from which you called upon the saints: but as you refused to follow them, you are still bewildered in its mazes, and here you are likely to remain. The destruction of faith is thus the inevitable consequence of the first principle of Protestantism, viz. that the Bible alone is sufficient to attain the knowledge of the Christian doctrine; and when you left this principle, you ceased to be a consistent Protestant. Now, Reverend Sir, look through that portion of the world which has admitted this principle, and in the honesty of your soul answer the questions,—"How many hundreds of sects, has it produced?" "Can you ever, admitting the truth of this principle, expect to diminish their number?" "Are all their contradictions contained in the Gospel?" "If the Gospel contains those contradictions, has it emanated from a God of truth?" "If the plain words of the Gospel cannot bring them to uniformity of sentiment, will any writing of any saint or number of saints, be less liable to misconstruction than is the Gospel itself?" "Has God then left us without any certain mode of discovering what he taught and what we should believe?" "Is faith or a firm belief of what God has taught possible, if we admit the first principle of Protestantism?" You seemed to say, and I say positively, that to know the doctrines of the Gospel, some farther aid beyond the Scripture and enlightened reason is necessary. I write you seemed to say, because though you did say that primitive antiquity was necessary to illustrate what was not clearly revealed in the Gospel, yet afterwards you retracted the assertion when you said—"Thus brethren would we arrive at a knowledge of the faith of the Gospel, by a reference to Scripture as the standard of doctrine; to primitive antiquity, as a model of practice." Before this you had said, primitive antiquity would illustrate what was not clearly revealed, so that as you in your latter passage, speak of Scripture only as the standard of doctrine by which we know the faith of the Gospel—I must confine the word practice to mean acts and not extend to primitive antiquity any authority respecting belief, though the saints were, according to another of your passages, to give us testimony, which we could not consistently reject, as to the fact of what doctrine they did receive, and what doctrine was believed in their day. Thus, Reverend Sir, until you shall make belief and practice have the same meaning, I must look upon this passage of yours as involved, inconsistent and contradictory; and unless you mean that you have some tangible aid to bring you to a certain knowledge of the meaning of what is obscure in

the Scripture, you have made no progress. If by practice you mean belief, you have written badly, when you wrote, the natural presumption will be that this belief and this practice were derived from the Apostles, and thus your whole passage is delusive. If you do not mean belief by practice, your passage is palpable, self-contradiction.

You produce against the Reverend Mr. Whitaker some passage of the Scripture, suppose "The Word was God," and "The Word was made flesh"—you assert, that it teaches the divinity of the Son. He produces against you, "the Father is greater than I," to show that our blessed Saviour disclaimed equality with the Father; you appeal to the saints of the early ages, who testify on your behalf. Mr. Whitaker asks you, whether they were infallible—you say, "No;" but they were good witnesses of the doctrine taught by the Church at that time. Mr. W. asks you whether that Church which so taught, was then infallible—you answer, NO. Suppose Mr. W. then admitted the testimony of the saints to be true, and asserted that the Church erred; what have you gained? Would not the reverend gentleman take exactly the very ground against you which you take against me? To make your argument good, then, you should either prove that the saints infallibly testified the true meaning of the passage: this you will not; nor will I: or that their testimony was true as to what the Church taught; this we admit: but you must now establish that the Church did with infallible certainty then teach the true meaning of the Scriptures. This I will uphold as a Catholic: but how you as a Protestant can do that is to me inconceivable, and how you without doing so could chaunt your *Io triumphe* at Macon, is to me unintelligible. Pray, Reverend Sir, do you now imagine you were warranted in asserting "This, brethren, is the ground assumed by the Church of which we are members; and it is precisely that high and vantage ground on which she can be safe from the assumptions of Papal power on the one hand; and the fury of untempered innovation on the other." Indeed, Reverend Sir, had you lived in England about two centuries and a half since, as perhaps some of your ancestors did, the good Queen Bess, supreme head in earth of God's Church, would have taught you to be more cautious in using the phrase "untempered innovation," which you now fling at the Reverend Mr. Whitaker, merely because he acts with a little more consistency than you do upon the principle which is common to you both, and which first gave being to your Church. Neither, Reverend Sir, do I envy you the lofty eminence to which you have attained; but I would advise you to use your elevation with modesty, to bear your honors meekly.

Before I leave this topic, I must however advert to one difficulty

which you appear to have altogether overlooked. How shall we manage, when we have found the saints and their books, to know the meaning of their writings? For instance, there is one passage in Tertullian, who perhaps is no saint, yet is a good witness, which we say teaches plainly the doctrine of the real presence, and some of your confreres quote the very passage to prove the very opposite doctrine.—You and the Presbyterians differ, you and the Baptists differ, as to the meaning of the passages from the saints and fathers. Thus, you have not as yet brought us one step in advance of the Bible, nor have you proved the Bible, nor any part of it, to have been revealed by God, nor given us a principle upon which to found that proof. Reverend Sir, I have permitted you to walk unmolested over many a miry pass, in which I could have made you sink, by merely flinging upon you the load of your own inconsistency, and depriving you of the aid of my concessions.—I come now to examine the most extraordinary passage that ever came under my eyes.

"With us, the Bible is authoritative: any other evidence admitted is but collateral, or confirmatory. This, brethren, is the ground assumed by the Church of which we are members; and it is precisely that high and vantage ground on which she can be safe from the assumptions of Papal power on one hand, and the fury of untempered innovation on the other. Let then the Church be the witness and keeper of Holy Writ; for so hath God ordained. Let her "have authority to judge and determine in controversies of faith; not that absolute authority which is predicated on the claim of infallibility; not that authority, which would fetter the minds and the consciences of her members; yea, fetter the word of God; but that authority, which, resting upon the possession of concentrated wisdom and piety, and upon the peculiar benediction of her divine founder and head, is all that she arrogates to herself,[1] inducing her not 'to go beyond the word of the Lord, to do either less or more.' Give to her less than this, and you make her a mere nullity; give to her more than this, and you then make the Bible the mere creature of her will: you magnify the ark itself above the law and the testimony, which it only enshrines."

Authority, Reverend Sir, may be defined, power properly derived to do some act. Now I am as perfectly at a loss as ever I was in my life, to know what is the meaning of your assertion, unless it is the following: "God has established the Church as the keeper of the Scriptures, and the witness of their having been kept unadulterated and entire." If this be your meaning, you are to all intents and purposes,

[1] Vide Article 20th.

so far, a Roman Catholic. I suppose you would not assert, that God ordained the Church to have the high and important charge here described, without his also doing what was further necessary, and what it is clearly in his power to do, viz. to make that keeper faithful, to make that witness sufficient. Indeed, it would be arguing gross stupidity in the eternal God, to suppose he would give the sacred deposit of heavenly truth to a keeper incompetent to its preservation; to a witness who would be incapable, inefficient, useless. For, if this keeper permitted the adulteration of the deposit, how should it become purified? If this witness could testify a falsehood, where would be our security for the knowledge of truth? It inevitably results, that we can have no certainty of the identity, the integrity and the purity of the sacred books, except from our certainty of the infallible fidelity of the keeper, and the infallible accuracy and honesty of the witness. Thus, Reverend Sir, I am extremely happy to find you and I are fully agreed, that we must depend upon the infallibility of the Church for the authenticity and accuracy of the present copies of that Bible, whose authority does not spring from the high power of the trusty keeper and infallible witness, which has preserved the sacred deposit, but from the supreme power and dominion of the great God, who gave these works to the care and keeping of the infallible Church. Of course, Reverend Sir, we will also agree, that the Church so commissioned, must have been that which was originally in existence, and spread through all nations, having but one doctrine, not contradictions of opinion, and which through all ages continued her regular succession and unbroken integrity, and that the commission could not be communicated to any portion, however numerous, or respectable, which in any nation broke away from this Church, separating from her communion, opposing her authority, vilifying her officers, decrying her practices, and charging her with being a faithless and traitorous keeper of the divine records, and a lying witness, testifying that God gave to her keeping, books which he never ordained her to keep. To suppose, the great Church of all nations, which had been originally established the keeper and the witness, which you so properly point out, and to suppose that during eight hundred years and upwards, she was thus unfaithful, as your book of homilies asserts, would destroy the principle you lay down, and would establish against the eternal God, ignorance, want of power, or want of care, for the preservation of truth. Of course, Reverend Sir, you will not make such blasphemous charges; you would prefer holding to your own principles, "Let then the Church be the witness and keeper of Holy Writ; for so God hath ordained."

We now come to another, and a very important topic. We have before seen, that even when the Church gives to us the sacred volume, and by reason of her divine commission, we are infallibly certain that what we read is truly the sacred treasure of divine truth, still, even with the aid of enlightened reason, and all the other circumstances of spiritual preparation and biblical investigation, equally honest persons diligently inquiring, "What is the doctrine that God teaches," can not agree as to the fact, but actually contradict each other. We consulted the Saints of the early ages, but as they were not infallible, though their opinions deserved respect, we are not bound to be led by them. In all this, Reverend Sir, you and I are perfectly agreed. I agree with you in your assertions: "Their testimony to facts, we deem it reasonable to receive." "We must suffer the Saints of the first ages, to declare what form of doctrine had been delivered to them; what was generally believed and practised in their day; and the natural presumption will be, that this belief and this practice were derived from the Apostles." "Their testimony as to facts, rests upon the basis of their unimpeached honesty and actual observation, and consequently may not be consistently rejected." In all this I agree fully with you; I find them testify, that controversies of faith arose, that is, that several persons interpreted the Scripture, so as to say, that it contained a special doctrine, whilst others, equally honest, contradicted them and said, that it did not contain that doctrine, but that it contained exactly what contradicted it. Thus you, I suppose would say, that the holy Scripture contained the doctrine of the divinity of our blessed Saviour, [while] your confrere in the ministry, the Reverend Mr. Whitaker, with equally honest purpose asserted, that it contained the doctrine, that our blessed Lord was not God. You said, it plainly contained the doctrine, that bishops and priests are different orders, and your confrere, Rev. Mr. Moderwell said, it contained the very contradictory doctrine. Such differences have occurred in the early ages; controversies arose: were all those contradictions contained in the Book? Impossible! How shall we know its meaning? You tell us, Reverend Sir, "Let her, that is, the Church, have authority to judge and determine in controversies of faith." Had you stopped here, we would still be fully agreed, but I cannot agree with you in what you have added; for I do not like to add glaring inconsistencies and palpable contradictions to my other faults.

As these, Reverend Sir, are strong expressions, and such as ought not to be used without very good cause, I feel myself bound to justify them. It is impossible for me to do so in the compass of this letter, but I shall make some preparation for my next, by giving here what I

conceive to be the plain meaning of that phrase, in the use of which we are agreed.

We found that God bestowed upon the Church authority to be the keeper and the witness of Holy Writ. This Writ contains His doctrine, which He requires man to believe; the firm conscientious belief of this doctrine is faith; faith is a mental act, not a mere oral declaration; a declaration of belief, contrary to mental conviction, is an act of hypocrisy, which is irreligious and displeasing to God, and can not therefore ever be pleasing to Him, or received by Him; and no man who makes such a profession can be honest, because, in making it he solemnly asserts what is not the fact.

Faith is the belief of what God has revealed; what the Bible contains has been revealed by Him; two persons differ as to the doctrine which it contains; this is a controversy of faith. How is it to be terminated? That is, in other words, how are we to know what is the contained doctrine? You tell us, "let the Church have authority to judge and to determine." Authority is power properly derived to do some act: the act in this place is, after examination to form a judgment; the judgment is, to assert and to testify which is the doctrine revealed by God, or contained in the Book; and to determine that, is to put an end to the controversy, by removing the doubt which existed: that doubt can not be removed, but by giving certainty; certainty can be given only by creating evidence of truth; evidence of truth, in this case, is clear, infallible, certain evidence, as to what doctrine revealed by God is contained in that passage or in that book. Thus, if the Church is to have such authority, she must have power properly derived to her, to do those acts; such power can be properly derived to her only from one source, which is the Diety himself. Therefore, unless God himself has given to her power to decide with infallible certainty what is the doctrine which God has revealed in that book, or that passage, she can have no authority to judge and to determine in controversies of faith. And if she has no such power, we have no mode of knowing with certainty what God has taught; because, no other body or individual lays claim to this authority except herself, and if her claim is unfounded, we have no ground of certainty, because all are liable to error: and God requires us to believe with a firm faith what He teaches, and yet leaves us without any certain mode of ascertaining what we are to believe. Of course, it would be preposterous to assert, that he requires of us to be hypocrites, by professing to believe, what we may or may not believe; and it would be equally preposterous to assert that his Church could have a power to judge and to determine what he has taught, and yet we not be bound in

conscience mentally to believe what the tribunal to which he gave the authority had proposed to us as being revealed by him.

I am, Reverend Sir, yours, and so forth,

A Roman Catholic.

LETTER VI.

Charleston, S. C., Aug. 28, 1826.

To the Rev. Hugh Smith, A.M.,

Rev. Sir:—In my last I agreed with you in saying, "Let then the Church be the witness and keeper of Holy Writ; for so God hath ordained. Let her have authority to judge and determine in controversies of faith." We saw, Reverend Sir, if she had such authority, it must have been derived from God, and must bind the conscience of man; because it would be folly to say that a controversy had been determined, when the parties were left at liberty to profess what they pleased; and it would be irreligious to assert that God could bind man to be a hypocrite, by requiring of him to profess the belief of what he did not conscientiously assent to be truth. The Church can therefore have no authority to judge and to determine controversies of faith, unless her decisions will bind the consciences of her members: and God cannot bind any person to receive and to obey a judgment and determination of a tribunal which might as easily lead man to error as to truth; if God then binds man to obedience he must himself lead the tribunal to give an infallibly true judgment; his command of obedience is a pledge that he will so direct; therefore it was, that in my last I wrote that you must ultimately come to maintain the infallibility of the Church. But no; you will not: for you immediately add, "not that absolute authority which is predicated upon the claim of infallibility." Really, Reverend Sir, you appear to me to wax worse in your contradictions, because you now deny what you before asserted. You asserted that the Church has authority; now you say she is not to have that authority "absolute." Good Sir, between the absolute possession of just power, and the absolute want of just power, there is no medium: for if a tribunal has power to decide, it absolutely has the power of decision: and if the tribunal has not absolute power of decision, it has no power to judge and to determine. I will allow that in some cases, and under certain conditions, a tribunal might have power, and in all other cases, and when those conditions do not exist, be without any power. In this case, however, there is an absolute power, so far as it goes, or there is none. For instance, the Governor of Georgia has power, in case he thinks a man unjustly

condemned to death, to grant him a respite until the Legislature shall decide upon his case; thus he has the absolute power of the respite, though not the absolute power of liberating the condemned; but if the Legislature shall decide upon pardoning the convict, then the Governor has the absolute power of liberating him altogether. Where there is authority, it is absolute to its extent; where it is not absolute, there is no authority. Your assertion that the Church has authority to judge and to determine, but that this is not an authority which is absolute, is to me unintelligible. "Not that authority which would fetter the minds and the consciences of her members." If it does not bind the mind, it is no authority regarding faith, for faith is a mental act, not an external profession. Let us suppose a case. The Church is about to decide a controversy of faith: you and your friend, Reverend Mr. Whitaker, appear before her. You both say she has authority to judge and to determine; that is, you say, "Our Saviour taught that he was co-equal God with his Father." Reverend Mr. W. says, "Our blessed Saviour taught that he was not co-equal God with his Father." You both state your reasons: the Church decides that she has full evidence that the Saviour taught your proposition. You call upon Mr. Whitaker to submit. He answers, "I cannot, for this would be giving the Church authority to fetter the mind and conscience." If he may lawfully thus answer, of what value is her authority to judge and to decide your controversy? Reverend Sir, it would be much better to do as Mr. Whitaker does, to deny altogether the existence of any ecclesiastical tribunal, than to be thus increasing your difficulties, and making your positions ridiculous. If she has authority, say so, and obey it; if she has not, boldly say so at once, but never speak again of such a thing as an ecclesiastical tribunal.

But at least, though she has not authority to fetter Mr. Whitaker's mind and conscience, he ought to pay external respect to a constituted tribunal by giving an open profession of doctrine, though his mind and his conscience may still preserve freedom and remain unfettered. I differ indeed very widely from your Reverend confrere in doctrine and in discipline; and upon this point he needs not my advice; but that advice would be, never to be guilty of hypocrisy by professing to belong to a body which adopts a code of doctrine that he does not in his conscience believe to be true.

As to fettering the word of God, it is an expression which, Reverend Sir, I did not expect from you, nor from any reasonable person. How many meanings has the word of God? Has it more than one? If the Saviour says, "This is my body," the phrase has some definite mean-

ing. When I have fully ascertained what that meaning is, do I fetter God's word by saying, "He meant what he said?" I really blush, Sir, whilst I write, and for the first moment since I took up my pen to address you, I feel almost indignant when I find it sought to degrade the eternal word of the Most High God, by assimilating it to the vile production of some pettifogging attorney, who, anxious to cheat, strives to hide the meaning of his phrases in ambiguous expressions, that he may escape being fettered to an inconvenient construction. Sir, the word of God has but one meaning, and that meaning is eternal truth, and its perfection would be fettering the expression to the display of that and only that; to effect this, Sir, would be to rid the world of those evils of which you affected to complain when you wrote.

"Had it been always thus interpreted, notwithstanding the varieties in the structure of the human mind, the Christian world would not have been called to witness so many divisions and sub-divisions, modifications and re-modifications of doctrinal incorrectness. Nor would the Bible itself have been insulted, by being given as the authority for so much that is absurd in theory, or demoralizing in practical tendency."

There is no species of science, the acquisition of which does not fetter the mind by restricting it to what is discovered to be truth. Such fettering is a blessing. There is, Sir, a species of pulpit-talk sometimes, indeed too often, mistaken for preaching and substituted therefor, which gives words without ideas; but it is worse than nonsense, because it deludes by the very sound having a semblance to reason: there is one excuse for him who uses it: he might himself be the dupe of the similitude. I should regret, Sir, to charge you with a deliberate intention to deceive your hearers, when you asserted that to fix the meaning which God intended his word should convey, would be what bears the appearance of a crime in the expression; "fettering the word of God." Sir, the Council of Nice fettered it, when they decided that those texts which Arius adduced to prove that the Son was not consubstantial to the Father, did not mean what he taught; the Council of Ephesus fettered it, when they decided that the texts which Nestorius adduced to prove that there were two persons in Christ, did not mean what he taught; the Council of Chalcedon fettered it, when they decided that the texts which Eutyches adduced to prove that there was only one nature in Christ, did not mean what he taught; the first Council of Jerusalem fettered it, when they decided that the texts adduced to prove the necessity of circumcision in Christianity, did not mean what some of the very first Christians contended was their meaning; the blessed Saviour himself fettered it, when he taught the disciples upon the mountain, and on

a thousand other occasions. Explanation of the true meaning of any law is not fettering the law, but applying it to its proper purpose, after having pointed out what that purpose is. Teaching mankind the law of God, and explaining precisely what he has revealed, is not fettering the mind, but is enlightening and instructing and freeing the mind from the fetters of ignorance. Do not, then, Reverend Sir, imagine that because you have culled from some former writers, of the modern English Church, a few of their phrases, the people of America will be led to imagine that the echo of delusive and refuted jargon contains sound reason. If the Church has authority to decide controversies of faith, that authority must be absolute, and must be founded upon her possession of a power to tell us with certainty what God has revealed; the instant man is taught with certainty what God has revealed, that moment his conscience is bound, in virtue of God's dominion only, it is true, but by the judicial testimony of the Church. So when I bow to the decision of the Supreme Court of the State, I do it, not because the judges have any inherent power of their own to bind me to obedience, but because I owe that obedience to the State, which commissioned the court to give me judicial testimony, as to what is the meaning of this passage of its law. The court possesses no odious power to fetter me or to fetter the law, but it has a wholesome and necessary authority to judge and to determine what is that law which is superior to the court and to the suitor: and it would be a strange plea to set up, that the court had authority to decide, but not to decide with certainty, not to fetter men nor the law, but still to decide.

But you will tell me that you do not contradict yourself, because you allow the Church "that authority which, resting on the possession of concentrated wisdom and piety, and upon the peculiar benediction of her divine founder and head, is all that she arrogates to herself, inducing her not to go beyond the word of the Lord to do either less or more." If I could know what you mean, I should be able in a word to dispatch your whole phrase. This quotation of yours, in my apprehension, should mean that the Church has the power of giving an infallibly correct judgment—yet that cannot be your meaning, because you said before, "not that absolute authority which is predicated on the claim of infallibility." You say here, the authority of the Church in her decisions in controversies of faith, is to judge and determine, not going beyond the word of God either for less; that is, giving us the doctrines whole and entire; so that we do not get less than the revelation and law of God; nor more; so that we get no more than the law of God. Then, if we get neither less nor more, we must get precisely the law of God. If she has

got a peculiar benediction of God for this purpose, that peculiar benediction must be infallibly efficacious, and so I shall by her testimonial judgment and determination, get precisely and infallibly the whole word or revelation of the Lord, neither more or less. If this is not authority predicated upon infallibility, I know not what it is: and if it be not, I have no certainty, because if she is not infallible she may err; and if she may err, I cannot be certain but she does actually err in this special instance. But you will ask, has she not God's peculiar benediction? I answer, by asking: will it infallibly lead her to truth? If it will, I have certainty, and her authority is predicated on infallibility. If it will not, I have no certainty, and bereft of that, I can have no faith, because faith is founded upon certain and not upon probably true testimony. It would be a novel mode, Reverend Sir, of commencing a Christian creed, to say: "I believe it is highly probable that there is one God. I believe that it is hightly probable that his only Son became man; I believe it is extremely probable he died on the cross. I believe it is very likely, indeed I am almost certain, that he will reward the good and punish the wicked." No, Sir, there can be no reasonable faith except upon the basis of infallible certainty; and the infallible certainty that the Church will give us the doctrine of God, rests upon her concentrated wisdom and piety, uniting the testimony of such a host so congregated from every quarter of the globe, as renders it impossible that they should either he deceived as to what common doctrine received from Christ was given by the founders of all the churches to the nations of the earth, and makes it impossible that they should conspire to corrupt that testimony. But, Reverend Sir, one would imagine you should be extremely cautious in unfolding the record of this tribunal, because the date of your change and all its circumstances, and the testimony against it are indelibly clear upon it. The second ground is, the peculiar benediction and promise to which you allude; but which certainly, if made, places you in no very enviable a station, because to justify yourself, you must prove that the benediction was inefficacious, and that the divine promise was forgotten; because unless the Church erred in her doctrine, you are opposed to God's truth. No wonder then that you instinctively shrink back and throw your old shield before you: "Give her less than this, and you make her a mere nullity; give her more than this, and then you make the Bible the mere creature of her will." As for the figure of "magnifying the ark above the law and the testimony which it enshrines," I do not understand it, unless you mean one of two things, neither of which, even in your own statement, is true; viz. either that the Church has no more to do with the Bible than has a

box in which it is kept—or that the dead ark had authority to judge and to determine controversies of faith, for which purpose it possessed concentrated wisdom and piety, and had received a peculiar benediction from God. You have therefore retreated to final unintelligibility, from multiplied contradiction. Here, at least from me, you may be secure.

And now in sober sadness I ask you, have you made one step towards removing the appalling difficulty which has met you at every turn? "But when we leave this general ground; when we ask what the faith of the Gospel is in all its parts, coincidence of sentiment is at an end, and many contradictory replies meet our ear. How then are we to choose amidst all these conflicting opinions of men? How is the faith of the Gospel to be more minutely ascertained?" You told us enlightened reason would lead us to knowledge; then you said that even if we found it, we still should not agree. You next answered, that primitive antiquity would illustrate those things not clearly revealed in the book. The saints would tell us what doctrines they derived from the Apostles: this was our tradition; of course you ran away from [it,] telling us that you only sent us to them for the purpose of knowing what they practised. The Bible was to give doctrine. Then you told us the Church had authority to decide in controversies of faith. But you soon denied this, for you told us that her decisions should not fetter our minds nor fetter the word of God. Still you told us that she had wisdom and piety and God's peculiar blessing, to establish her authority; and yet though so established, she may err, although she could not give us more than the word of the Lord, nor less than the word of the Lord, and yet, giving precisely the word of the Lord, she might err. The whole conclusion then seems by some magic brought to this, that by the word of the Lord is meant the Bible. The old question then recurs:—suppose I believe this to be God's book, how shall I know its meaning where there are so many contradictory explanations? And to this, Sir, you give no answer. By what right then, Reverend Sir, do you presume to call me erroneous in my interpretation of that book? By what right, Sir, do you presume to tell Mr. Moderwell or Mr. Whitaker, or any other human being, that you or your society are right, and that any one who differs from you is wrong? I differ, Sir, from Mr. Whitaker's explanations of the sacred volume, as much probably as does any other human being. I adore the Son and the Holy Ghost with the self-same homage as I do the Father: I believe, as firmly as I do that I now write, that he who was crucified on Calvary was the eternal God, by whom all things were made, having a body and soul personally united to his divine nature. But I am at as perfect a loss as I ever was in my life to know how, when Mr. Whita-

ker denies that those propositions are contained in the Bible, you can prove with certainty that they are. You adduce texts; and he adduces texts in contradiction to you. You say he mistakes; he charges the mistake upon you. You say that the Church in the first ages explained them as you do, and that you therefore must be right. He asks you whether the Church was then infallible in her explanations: you say, "No, she was liable to error." He says that she erred in this explanation if she gave it. Who is now to decide it between you? "Let the Church have authority to decide this controversy," you say. He answers, "But you said she was not infallible and had no authority to fetter God's word." I have read some very fine sounding works which would decide against you, upon the very ground that you followed the opinion of the Church in those early ages; because the blow-pipe had not as yet been invented, nor was there a sufficient number of Greek names given to plants and flowers; science was then only in its embryo—America had not been discovered, and therefore the Apostles could not testify the doctrines of the Saviour, nor could this testimony have been secured and perpetuated, for the mariner's compass was not constructed, neither gun-powder nor steam-engines were used; Luther had not written, nor were the articles of the English Protestant Church enacted by proper authority. Reverend Sir, I am tired, and so I suspect are you; and so I fear are my readers. I trust when you next hold a convention of your Church, you will have the goodness to leave us unmolested; and I shall on my part cease to subscribe myself.

Yours, and so forth,

A Roman Catholic.

THE VICIOUS CIRCLE

[The following brief critique upon a sophism frequently made use of against the Catholic argument, is extracted from the *United States Catholic Miscellany,* for 1824.]

Dr. Watts, in his *Treatise of Logic,* and other writers of his description, charge Roman Catholics with gross and palpable absurdity in their arguments, and exemplify the sophism of the *Vicious Circle,* by reference to the arguments of Catholics, viz.

"A vicious circle is when two propositions, equally uncertain, are used to prove each other. Thus Papists prove the authority of the Scriptures by the infallibility of their Church, and then prove the infallibility of their Church from the authority of the Scriptures."

To a school-boy this appears a formidable barrier against Popery, and many a sage professor has learnedly declaimed against Popish absurdity, in the detail of the exemplification. Stamped with the authority of a dictum of the schools, the example passes with equal currency as the definition.

Let us meet the mighty adversary. To do so we must take the following three several cases.

Case 1. A Papist argues with a person who believes in the authority of the Scriptures, but who does not believe in the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church. No one will tell us that the said Papist is guilty of bad logic and is a sophist, when he thus addresses such a person—"Sir, you acknowledge this book to be authority, I shall shew you from several passages thereof, that the Church is infallible." This is not a vicious circle, for there is no question between them of the authority of the Scripture, and to such a person the Papist does not prove the authority of the Scriptures, by the infallibility of the Church. Hence, in this case, there is no vicious circle, for if he prove the infallibility of the Church from the authority of the Scriptures, he only proves that which has been questioned, from that of which there was no question.

Case 2. A Papist argues with a person who acknowledges the infallibility of the Church, but questions and doubts the authority of certain Books. No one can say it would be sophistry to address such a person in these words—"Sir, you allow the body of true believers, that is the

Church, does certainly know what God has revealed, and can point out with infallible certainty the books which do contain his revelations. Sir, that Church testifies to you that these books do contain his revelation. Therefore, by your principle, you must receive these books as the word of God."

This certainly is not proving one questionable proposition by another, and then proving the second by the first. But it is proving that which has been questioned and of which there was doubt, by that of which there was no doubt. This is no sophistry.

Case 3. A Papist argues with a person who does not believe either in the infallibility of the Church or in the authority of the Scriptures. In this case he cannot assume either as a principle. What is he to do? What would a Protestant do? The Catholic can do at least as much. The Protestant says that without the authority of an infallible Church he can prove the authority of the Scriptures. The same arguments will, in the mouth of a Catholic, lead to the same conclusion. Therefore, if it be possible for the Protestant, it is possible for the Catholic—therefore the Catholic needs not the infallibility of the Church, to do what his neighbor can do without it.

Having proved the authority of the Scriptures thus, the Catholic may next proceed upon what he has proved, now assuming as a principle that of which there can be no doubt. Thus we are brought to case 1, in which there is no sophism.

Or the Catholic may find, without the authority of the Scripture, reasons to convince a person, that if God speaks he must establish some mode by which man may infallibly find out what he teaches; and next that this mode is by receiving the testimony of the great body of the Church; and thus we are brought to case 2, in which there is no sophism.

Thus, whether a Catholic or Papist argues with a person who allows the authority of Scripture, but does not allow Church infallibility; or argues with a person who allows Church infallibility, but does not allow Scriptural authority; or argues with a person who does not allow either; he proceeds to prove both points without sophistry: he does not argue in a vicious circle—he is not a violator of the rules of sound sense or good logic—and Dr. Watts and his imitators, either were very ignorant of the manner in which Catholics argue, or very ignorant of what is meant by the sophism of a *Vicious Circle*—or were dishonest men who deceived their pupils upon an important subject, and who bore false testimony against the best and most numerous, and most enlightened society in the whole world.

We leave to their admirers and followers their choice of the several

portions of this good disjunctive proposition, and we trust that each day will add new light to the intellect, and new desires to the will, so that true knowledge may increase, sophistry be detected and exposed, and the most important concerns of men be brought more closely under the eye of reason and the regulation of correct judgment.

> A little learning is a dangerous thing;
> Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring.
> Those shallow draughts intoxicate the brain;
> But drinking largely sobers us again.
>
> *Pope.*

CALUMNIES OF J. BLANCO WHITE

Letters addressed to the Roman Catholics of the United States of North America

[From the *United States Catholic Miscellany* for 1826-8.]

LETTER I.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 4, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I am a native of Ireland, but a citizen of America, and of course, have resided during several years in this Union. I am a Roman Catholic; and one of the principal inducements which operated on my mind in preferring this to any other part of the world was, not merely the excellence of its political institutions, but, as I flattered myself, the absence of bigotry. I was led to believe that, although men differed from each other in religion, yet when there was no profit or preference to be obtained by acrimony, I should not meet with any. I was also led to think the American mind was candidly and sincerely occupied in searching after truth; and that, as it was given to investigation, it would speedily arrive at its discovery. I must confess, that I have been disabused of some [part] of my error. I found that there was in the general constitutions of most of the States, a principle which restrained men from being tyrants over the consciences of their neighbor, but that neither law nor constitution had effected what I now find cannot be produced by mere political regulation—that cordial and affectionate feeling which is the result of true charity for each other, amongst men who differ in religious belief. I found what I was altogether unprepared for; that, in many of our States, a Roman Catholic, though legally and politically upon a level with his fellow-citiezns, was however too often looked upon, by reason of his religion, as in some degree morally degraded. I found that it was by no means considered a want of liberality, on the part of the Protestants, to vilify the Catholic religion, and to use the harshest and most offensive terms when designating its practices; but that if a Catholic used any phrase however modified, which even insinuated any thing derogatory to the Protestant religion, he was marked out as a shocking bigot, and his offence was unpardonable.

The newspapers, I perceived, were generally stuffed with extracts and articles which were offensive to Catholics; but the editors were very careful not to bring a hornet's nest about their ears by inserting a paragraph offensive to any Protestant society. I had frequent opportunities of conversing with polite and well-informed Protestant gentlemen, and they, though knowing my religion, used the most offensive phraseology when speaking of our Church or our institutions, being, I am convinced, totally unconscious that the language which they used was originally constructed to offend us. They spoke to me of the Romish Church, and of Popish priests, and of Romish bishops, and adoration of images, as undisguisedly as if they were not using the most insulting language. I knew they meant nothing unkind; I had abundant evidence of their good will; yet, though I felt that it would be indelicate in me to wound them, by requesting they would change their phrases, I deemed it more than matter of curiosity to discover, why this language was used, and why the Catholic was undervalued.

It struck me, as this had been an English colony, and as many of the gentlemen whom I met had either been educated in England, or under English teachers, that they had learned also some of the English fabrications. I took an opportunity of asking a friend of this description to inform me in sincerity whether he thought a good Roman Catholic could be a good republican citizen. After such a request and explanation as made him feel at full liberty, he very candidly told me that he did not. I followed up my inqury, and soon discovered that the general impression amongst the best informed citizens of the Southern States was altogether unfavorable to Catholics, upon the principle that the Catholic religion must produce effects, which would be fatal to our state of society and government. So far from condemning those gentlemen, my respect for their kindness was increased, though I lamented the mistake into which they had fallen as to our tenets, and the general character of our religion. And, my friends, if our religion was what they were led to believe it was, very few, if any, of us would continue in the communion of the Holy See. More extended travelling gave me an opportunity of making more extensive inquiry; and every where in twelve of our States where I had the means of knowing pretty accurately the general sentiment, I have no doubt now upon my mind, that, as a body, we are undervalued by our fellow-citizens; and that this arises not from any bad feeling on their part generally towards us, but from their mistaking our character and tenets. I believe the great majority are well disposed to meet us with cordial affection, but I fear there are some whose interest and whose bigotry urge them to keep us estranged from each other.

Having convinced myself of the truth of these facts which I have thus stated, my next inquiry was into their cause. I shall give you my opinion and its foundation. I have not hastily formed it; nor have I an unfriendly feeling towards my fellow-citizens. These States were British colonies, now little more than half a century ago. In every one of them except Pennsylvania, the penal laws against Catholics were in full force, and in most of them they were executed with unrelenting rigor. In Pennsylvania, though the Catholic was not legally persecuted, he existed under that moral degradation which resulted as well from the self-esteem of the Quaker, as from the Protestant's viewing him as his inferior in the mother country and in the other colonies. Perhaps it will be scarcely a digression here to remark, that Pennsylvania has been amply repaid for her just benevolence. The rapid improvement of that State has been generally attributed to the steady, sober industry of the Quakers; no one will deny that they are the prominent figures upon the canvass, and they not only will bear inspection, but at distance will appear alone. Yet he who examines closely, will, behind their large coats, observe that much of the back scenery is concealed; he will also discover, that the Irish and the few German Catholics, whom their friends sent to till the back country, are found, where that back ground is visible, to be those upon whom the drudgery devolved, and they are painted busily engaged at the plough and with the axe. When the drum called forth the colonists to battle, the Pennsylvania line was consequently found to be principally composed of Irish Catholics. New York then had her persecuting law; but since it has been repealed, the Irish Catholics have wrought her up into wealth, as they previously did Pennsylvania.

I shall only state that, at the period of the Revolution, the Catholic was by British policy, by British contrivance, by British example, and by British law, degraded in every colony, persecuted in all but one. The feelings of nations do not suddenly or very quickly subside, much less become altogether different. Only half a century has passed away since this was the case, and it could hardly be expected that all this feeling could be forgotten by this time. Men will always be prone to say, there must have been some good cause for legal oppression. Do not mistake me; I do not intend to say, that the excuse will ever hold good for the oppression of a Protestant by a Catholic, or if so, it can only be in Spain. But in all other places, it is but reasonable, some philosophers say, to suppose the Catholic gave cause, or if he did not, the Protestant thought he did, which is equally sufficient. Now, you and I probably believe that no cause was given; but let us concede that there was cause, and leave to those who made and executed the penal

laws to settle their account with a just and merciful God. I think we may fairly state this as one cause of the present dis-esteem in which I believe we are held by many of our fellow-citizens; it operates silently, imperceptibly, but efficaciously. It resolves itself into this soliloquy—"My ancestors were obliged by circumstances to oppress Catholics, my ancestors were good, they could not be guilty of cruelty or of injustice; I have heard them say there was good cause; for, that formerly Catholics were more dangerous than those of the present day are. We have relieved them, I am glad of it; if their predecessors had been as good as those now, the harsh laws would not have been necessary; but still there is something not right about their system." In such a way as this does a good heart endeavor to indulge its feelings of affection for its family and for its fellow-citizens; for the fame of the family requires an imputation upon the Catholic, and we are naturally the sufferers.

Thus that strongest bias to which the human mind is liable, that bias arising from affection for one's kindred, respect for the cherished memory of one's immediate ancestors, creates in good and amiable minds, a powerful though unsuspected prejudice against us. There are no minds over which this prejudice has a more extensive and a better established dominion than those of generous and amiable females, for the very excellence of their disposition leads them to cherish warmly those family attachments from which it springs. This will, I believe, tend greatly to explain what I have frequently observed to be an undoubted fact, and still scarcely to be otherwise explained: that the prejudices against us were strongest in the minds of those ladies who, either sprung from or were connected with the old families who, under the British rule, held stations or offices which made them, in some way or other, parties to the approval or execution of the penal laws. That such is the fact in the old country and in this, will scarcely be questioned by those who have had an opportunity of making the observation. Yet those ladies have the very best dispositions and the kindnest hearts; they are humane, generous, and affectionate; but their family affections necessarily hold the first place, and they cannot believe that their fathers, and their uncles, and their progenitors, in whom they have found so many good qualities, could be persecutors of innocent people; there must, they think, have been something bad, and of sufficient criminality in the Catholics of that day to have provoked this oppression. Let the practical error be only once in existence. Let men of a certain standing in society be in the habit of oppression, and it becomes a necessary consequence, that the most amiable portion of society becomes unconsciously the preserver of prejudice, and indirectly the advocate of oppression.

This has enabled me often to excuse what I lamented, and solve what would be otherwise insoluble.

Another great source of prejudice arises from religious feeling. Every mind, not actually infidel, views with more or less reverence the edifice for public worship; and generally the mind is prepared to receive with scarcely a suspicion of falsehood, every statement made in this sacred place by the man who is said and believed to bear the divine commission, to announce saving truths to the world. In a land where the law prevented the existence of a Catholic, the public teacher of a religion created upon the assumption, that the Catholic religion was grossly erroneous, might safely indulge in what statements he thought proper; and naturally he would be expected occasionally to inveigh against those tenets, to destroy whose prevalence was the object of his ministry: and to his declaration there would be no reply. That such was the fact, there exists the most superabundant evidence. It was not only natural, that the evils which were said to spring from those tenets should be pointed out and emblazoned, but we have proof that they were. When a century had thus passed away in repeated inculcations of this description, by the ministers of God, in his holy place, to a religious people, can we wonder at the existence of strong prejudice in the minds of that people, not only against the tenets, but also against those who hold them? Religious prejudice is perhaps stronger than that of family affection; either is very powerful; but what must be that prejudice which is a combination and a sublimation of both?

Had those holy men contented themselves with the mere statement of facts, and argued fairly from those facts, we should have had no reason to complain. But such was not the case. That which was of dubious or equivocal appearance was, against every rule of charity, exhibited in the worse manner to which any forced construction could drag it; and when there were not sufficient facts to make out the case, the defect was supplied by fiction. I do not charge all the sacred functionaries with wilful misconstruction and with fabrication; because there were some who did not stoop to those means. Others had prejudices, and were misled—they believed what they taught. Others cared not for its truth or falsehood, but did what was in the routine of their duty; so that I am far from charging the body at large as fabricators, though they made extensive use of fabrications. Thus, misrepresentation was superadded to prejudice; and all obtained the name of religious truth. Thus, the more of religious zeal existed, the more extensively was prejudice against the Catholic spread abroad. Before I close this series of

letters, I shall exhibit to you such authentic facts to support my several assertions, as shall well warrant every conclusion that I draw.

Not only then were affection and religion, the two finest sources of human feeling, poisoned against us, but history was outraged, and the unbiased judgment was flagrantly misled. I here make an assertion, which if I shall not succeed in proving to its full extent, I consent that all which I shall address to you in vindication of our character to our fellow citizens shall be valueless. No nation ever was so guilty of a systematic destruction of the truth of history for any purpose, as was the English nation in order to create prejudice against the Catholics. I would be content to put myself upon a trial for life and death, upon the issue of the truth or falsehood of the following propositions, after I should have had the opportunity of proving their truth before an impartial, honest American jury. The British Protestant nation has been almost continually employed in destroying the truth of history for the purpose of bringing obloquy upon the Catholics!! The Government aided in this work, and the Catholic was not allowed to answer, nor allowed the means of refutation. Thus a new source of prejudice was added. From the most voluminous histories to the mere chronological tables; from the College to the Nursery, the labor was to create and to perpetuate prejudice: and this has continued during centuries. The principle having been adopted soon after the discovery of the art of printing, those distortions of facts have the appearance of being the original and authentic statement of what occurred, and the press having been in the hands of only the opponents of Catholics, no counter statement could be sent forth.

Besides the distortion of history, the sciences have been employed by the British nation against us. Her teachers of logic, in their elementary treatises, assume falsehoods as facts, to give as examples of sophism what they state to be our mode of reasoning, when in truth we do not so mock reason. In their metaphysics, every opportunity is taken by many of their writers to turn us into ridicule or to exhibit us as senseless; they turn aside from their astronomical observations to lecture upon the inquisition, which they will make a constituent part of our creed, against our will; the chemist uses his laboratory to analyze our Sacraments; the professor of medicine harangues upon our superstition; the surgeon dissects our saints; the jurist laments the ignorance of our councils. I have heard a man who knew not the first principle of the civil code and could not give a rational definition of what was the nature of a law, though he was a professor of law! deliver flappant opinions upon canons of our Church which he had never seen, and which,

had he read, he could not understand, because of his ignorance of history, whilst his audience gazed wisely upon each other as they applauded the only part of the sentence which they could repeat, *the despotism and absurdity of Popery.* The very principles of the British law as of force in these States when they were colonies, were predicated upon the assumption that our religion was an illegal superstition bordering upon treason. Thus the very study of science in Britain and in her colonies was calculated to create prejudice of a very formidable nature against us.

In belles lettres, the same consequence was insured. The mythology of the heathens was explained by an exhibition of its analogy with our creed; we were represented as the enemies of taste, the lovers of ignorance, the destroyers of the fine arts; worse than Vandals and more ferocious than Goths. Geography, as with an English tongue she described the nations of the earth, was always sure to dwell upon the vices and the crimes and the follies of every nation in which our religion was established or prevailed, and she became hyperbolically eloquent, as she glowed in her description of the virtues, the glories, the wisdom and the superiority of the few Protestant states that concentered in themselves every real and imaginary good which the mind could conceive. Even Protestant England never persecuted, and Catholic Italy blazed with the fires of the Inquisition.

I am tired of the enumeration. My object was to shew how it was morally, I was about to say physically impossible for any American Protestant, however high his rank, exalted his mind, extensive his reading, or comprehensive his charity, to be free from violent prejudice against Catholics at the period of the revolution, just fifty years ago. My friends, if we were placed in the same situation as they were, would not our prejudices be what theirs were? I would now bring your attention to another topic. We say they did not know us: but the present generation ought to know what we are. This, I contend, is an error. It is impossible that as yet they should know what we are, and therefore whilst we regret the prejudice which even as yet extensively exists to our disadvantage, we should rather endeavor by proper means to remove it, than blame those who are its victims, because they cannot do what is impossible. I shall shew you briefly the obstacles which are as yet in their way.

They are still subject to the operation to a certain extent, though thank God, greatly diminished, of that prejudice which springs from family affection; to which is added the prejudice which springs from that pride of adherence to party, to which we all are subject, from which

it is extremely difficult to become disengaged. They are yet liable to nearly the same extent to religious prejudices, with the diminution that is caused by the greater caution of making an attack where a reply and a retort may be expected, and in some places, but not very many, the opportunity which is afforded for correcting mistakes. They have still the same distorted histories, to correct whose statements so little has been done; and that little so lately as to have yet scarcely excited curiosity; much less, research; much less, change of opinion. Scarcely a change has taken place in the mode of abusing science or literature for the purpose of injuring us. I have once, not very long since, felt a kind of melancholy amusement, in which however my reveries were occasionally disturbed by a glow of involuntary indignation, at contemplating one of the first graduates at the annual commencement of the College of this State, pouring out as copious a collection of black vomit against our creed as if he was upon the point of expiring of a religious yellow fever. The poor creature could not be so much blamed, for he had probably been infected in the library, if not tainted from his childhood; but I can vouch that no professor of that institution was guilty of creating his disease, nor had the simpleton himself the slightest opportunity of becoming acquainted with several topics upon which he raved; but the books too often contain what the teacher would not have written. How many volumes of religious tracts; how many Gospel and Evangelical and Christian periodical publications, teem with misrepresentation and abuse of our creed? Nay, look at the common newspapers of the day, whose editors boast of their liberality, and confirm their claim to the title by most copious and liberal quotations from every British hireling or malevolent infidel; in the midst of all this, how is it possible for us to expect that we should be held in just estimation by our fellow-citizens? It is then a duty which we owe to them and to ourselves, to attempt our vindication. As we cannot assemble as a body to do this; as our Bishops do not find it convenient or expedient to act as the Irish Bishops and English Vicars have done under similar circumstances, an individual has taken the liberty of addressing to you his sentiments upon the subject. I shall therefore examine the charges made upon us, and give the best answers that I can, in hope that some of our Protestant fellow-citizens may examine the accusation and the defence, and that I may thus happily, at least lessen the amount of that prejudice which I cannot hope to destroy. I shall begin by examining the charges made by the Rev. Joseph Blanco White; because I observe that his work is particularly lauded by the clergy of the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Methodist churches of the District of Columbia, and that strenuous efforts are

now making to disseminate the same, for the purpose of adding to the prejudice which unfortunately exists. I know that I undertake a weighty task, but labor does not discourage me. These pieces shall appear in the Miscellany, addressed to you, and should I find that you approve of them by patronizing the paper, and that they are thought by my Protestant fellow-citizens to lead to a better feeling between them and us, and that God should give me health and leisure, when I shall have done with Mr. White, I have many more to succeed in turn. I am my friends,

Yours, and so forth,

B. C.

LETTER II.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 11, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My friends.—I stated that I would commence my investigation by examining the charges which are made upon us by the Rev. Joseph Blanco White. You will naturally ask who he is. I beg to inform you that I know nothing more of him than the account which he gives of himself in his evidence against our religion. That evidence, if I must so call it, is contained in a book which he appears to have published in London, in April or May, 1825; and which is dedicated to the Provost of Oriel College, Oxford; as also in *Letters from Spain* under the signature of Don Leucadio Doblado; and which appeared in the *New Monthly, (London) Magazine.* In the dedication, Mr. White very plainly exhibits his object, in the following passages; to understand which, it is necessary to know that the writer complains of having been the victim of Catholic persecution in Spain. He states that his patron and he have a "similarity of views as to what is called the *Catholic question.*" We are all well acquainted with the sentiments generally entertained in England by the reverend dignitaries and officials of the established Church, upon this question: but Mr. White and his patron appear to be men of most liberal and tolerant disposition, if the gentleman himself is worthy of credit. He writes:

"From the friendly intercourse with which you have honored me, I know that you hold it wrong to put down religious error by force, or to propagate religious truth by degrading and branding those who do not think with us. I have suffered too much from religious despotism, not fully and cordially to hold the same doctrine. The fetters which, by

God's mercy, I have been enabled to break, I would rather die than help to rivet upon a fellow-Christian."

This would do very well, had it not the following tailpiece:

"But the power which made me groan in protracted bondage, is striving to obtain a direct influence in this Government; and I cannot regard such efforts with apathy. For myself, I have nothing to fear; but I deem it a debt of gratitude to volunteer my testimony in the great pending cause, that it may be weighed against the studied and colored evidence of such writers, as would disguise the true character of the spiritual tyranny, whose fierce grasp I have eluded. Indeed I would never have shown myself in the field of controversy, but for the appearance of a book evidently intended to divert the public from the important, and, to me, indubitable fact, that sincere Roman Catholics cannot conscientiously be tolerant. How far, my dear sir, you are convinced of this, I cannot take upon myself to say: but I am sure you will allow, that if such be the real character of Catholicism, the only security of Toleration must be a certain degree of intolerance, in regard to its enemies; as prisons in the freest governments are necessary for the preservation of freedom."

In this we observe that the reverend writer asserts it to be an indubitable fact that sincere Roman Catholics cannot conscientiously be tolerant; that their religion is spiritual tyranny; that it is trying to obtain a direct influence in the British Government, that he cannot regard its effort with apathy, that he deems it necessary for him to serve in the great pending cause, viz. the discussion of the Catholic's claims to civil and religious liberty; that he deems it as necessary to have a certain degree of intolerance against Catholics as to have prisons. Thus his object evidently, from his own declarations, is to prevent Catholic emancipation; to keep the British Catholics politically incarcerated; and the manner in which he will contribute to this end will be, by giving what he calls the real character of Catholicism.

The reverend writer would find some difficulty in reconciling his contradictions, "that he would rather die than help rivet fetters upon a fellow-Christian," "that he has volunteered his services to help to keep his fellow-Christians in civil and political incarceration under a free and tolerant government, which has persecuted and still afflicts its subjects for adhering to the ancient religion of the founders of that government itself."

But, my friends, were I to dwell upon every contradiction of this liberal persecutor, I should indeed have a long series of letters to write. One specimen more, and I shall be done with this dedication. After

candidly stating in all appearance the truth, in the outset, viz. that his principal motive was what he calls a generous impulse of gratitude to save a generous country, he next tells us that such was not the motive; for in truth his work is only indirectly connected therewith; and although his object was that "his tesimony in the great pending cause, should be weighed against the studied and colored evidence" of the advocates of Catholics, yet "the parliamentary question about the claims of the Roman Catholics is by no means the object he had in view whilst writing."

"I have thus far thought it necessary to touch upon the political question with which my work is indirectly connected. I say indirectly, because the parliamentary question about the claims of the Roman Catholics is by no means the object which I have had in view while writing. I will not deny that I should be glad if my humble performance could throw any light on a question in which the welfare of this country is so deeply concerned; but it is probable that it will not appear till after the decision of the Parliament. Let this, however, be as it may, still I humbly hope, that, whether the Roman Catholics are admitted into Parliament, or allowed to continue under the disabilities which their honest opponents lament, my labor will not have been thrown away. For as the danger which may threaten this country in the admission of Roman Catholic legislators, depends entirely upon their religious sincerity; I shall not have troubled the public in vain, if either I can convince the conscientious of the papal communion, that a Roman Catholic cannot honestly do his duty as a member of the British Parliament without moral guilt; or, what I ardently wish, my arguments should open their eyes to the errors of their Church."

I believe we may fairly conclude that the writer was sincere in his declarations, that his object in writing was not the question of the claims of the Catholics, but of his own recompense; that his book is one of those compilations which has been got up just in time to be put into the hands of members of Parliament, so as to influence votes, but not in time to admit of any refutation before that vote is given: for it was avowedly written in reference to the great pending question, at a time when it was certain of being carried in the House of Commons, and by no means certain that a majority could be got up in the House of Lords to reject it; and Mr. White and his patron, though very liberal men, had determined to do their utmost to keep the Catholics in their state of degradation. I give them very little credit, however, for their bungling mode of keeping their own secret.

Mr. White's object, then, very clearly was, to write as forcibly as

he could, to prove that Roman Catholics ought not to be admitted to an equality of civil and political rights with their Protestant fellow-subjects. Can this be the object of Bishop Kemp of Baltimore, and the twenty pastors of the Protestant Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Methodist Churches of the District of Columbia and its vicinity, in procuring a re-print of this book in America? They deserve the approbation of their fellow-citizens for their zeal in promoting Christian charity. They deserve the lasting gratitude of their Roman Catholic neighbors for their exertions on their behalf.

I have now to take Mr. White's account of himself. He is a Priest in the English Protestant Church, who was formerly of the Roman Catholic, and who received his orders in that Church, in Spain, of which he is a native. He is now, I understand, a minister in some Church, in or near London; he was a graduate of Seville, and took out his theological certificate of qualification at Osuna. He held a prebend's stall in the Royal Chapel at Seville, and was a member of the collegiate Churches of that city, a synodal examiner in the diocess of Cadiz, and a member of some literary society: the whole of which is appended to his name in the title page of his book, together with a statement that he is the author of *Doblado's Letters* from Spain. Of course the object is to shew how great a man and therefore how good a witness is Mr. White. Upon all this, I shall merely remark, that it is with titles sometimes as with coat of arms in heraldry, the plain field which is without any emblazonment is evidence of the most remote and illustrious antiquity, and a single emblem of that which is next in dignity. The undecorated name of the individual, when good, is the best recommendation: hence *George Washington* sounds better than if six kings at arms lost their breath in the successive enumeration of orders and decorations: and the plain title of "virtuous man" or "good priest" would have raised Mr. White more in our estimation, than if the whole title page were filled with the offices which he had held, and the stations which he had deserted. To us, the enumeration of those places conveys no idea of any superior acquirements in the individual, for with the exception of one, they are all within the reach of any young man of very moderate capacity, much less than I believe Mr. White to possess, though I rate his low enough. The first two titles merely shew that he went through his usual collegiate examinations, the third shews that he had license to preach and had an appointment; if the College of St. Mary a Jesu in Seville is, as many such are, a mere sinecure benefice, or as several others in Spain are, one next to a sinecure, the qualifications for its rectorship are merely nominal; the place of a synodal examiner in the Diocess of Cadiz would

indeed be some evidence of his good standing in the Church, if he lived in that Diocess and discharged its duties; but with him, living in Seville, it was a mere honorary appointment, and no evidence whatever of theological standing.

Indeed, the gentleman gives us, himself, very clearly the value of his titles, when he informs us, page 17, of the manner in which he obtained his degree in Osuna. "He was not of sufficient standing" to obtain it at Seville, it was necessary to have a diploma to take the place in the College of St. Mary, at Seville, he therefore took it at Osuna which was not strict. The value of a degree at Osuna is known in Spain, but it sounds very well in England and America. In page 18, Mr. W. writes: "I owed my preferment to a public display of theological knowledge." To understand this, it is necessary to know what is required by the canons of the Roman Catholic Church, on such occasions. When a benefice is vacant, public notice is given, the candidates for the place are to produce their documents of qualification to discharge its duties, and they who are admitted to be sufficiently qualified enter into contest before a board of sworn examiners, who are generally appointed, by alternative nomination, by the Bishop and by the Chapter: the clergymen who form this board of examiners make a written return of the names of the candidates, arranged according to their respective merits. If the benefice is in the gift of a patron or of electors, the selection is then made from the three highest names upon the list; the patron has the right of presenting the selected individual to the Bishop, who if he approves of him inducts him, or if he disapproves of the person presented requires another name, which must be furnished within a given time, or the patron loses his right for that time, and the Bishop fills the vacancy. This examination takes place in public. The principle was wisely laid down by the Church, for those places in which there exists a right of patronage, to prevent the introduction of improper persons; but frequently the practice, is very different from what was contemplated by the theory. By the contrivance of the patrons, it frequently has happened that a person who would be a candidate was taught that contention would be madness, because that the patron had already fixed upon the person who was to fill the place, and that any other even successful opponent would not be presented; but would earn the patron's ill-will, and that of the friends of the designated candidate. Thus frequently the examination was but a form. Again, in all the contests between young men for lesser offices, such as Mr. White's, the examination was far from severe, and contest was not difficult. From the gentleman's own shewing in page 17, "the high rank which the author sustained as a minister of the

Roman Catholic Church," is not in point of fact equal to the rank of any pastor of that Church in the city of Baltimore; yet the Right Reverend Dr. Kemp and his clergy put it forward as a very strong feature to recommend the word.

"*Recommendation.*—The *Letters of the Reverend Blanco White* contain a temperate and able exposition of the errors of Popery. The high rank which the author sustained as a minister of the Roman Catholic Church, eminently qualified him for the task which he had undertaken and so well fulfilled; and his familiar acquaintance with all the secret springs and movements of that wonderful system, has enabled him to diversify his discussion with many highly interesting and important incidents. We therefore cheerfully recommend the work as highly deserving of public attention.

Rt. Rev. Jas. Kemp, D.D.	Rev. J. P. K. Henshaw,	Rev. S. B. Balch, D.D.
Rev. W. H. Wilmer, D.D.	J. R. Keech,	R. Post,
Basil Keith,	C. B. Tippet,	W. Nevins,
S. H. Tyng,	H. N. Gray,	A. Helfenstein,
W. Hawley,	J. N. Campbell,	T. E. Bond, M.D.
E. Allen,	C. Harrison,	S. K. Jennings, M.D.
	J. Guest,	

As a theologian we may find his qualifications, by his own account of the manner in which he attended to his studies. The following extracts are from Letter V. Volume 2, for 1821, from July to December, printed by Littel of Philadelphia, and Henry of New York, to the pages of which edition I shall always refer, page 290:

"An imperfect knowledge of the Logic and Natural Philosophy was all I acquired at the University before I began the study of divinity."

Page 292. "French philosophy had not found its way to the University of Seville at the time when I was studying divinity."

Page 293. "The greatest part of my time, with the exception of that required for my daily attendance at the dull lectures of divinity professors, was devoted to the French critics, Andre Le Bossu, Batteux, Rollin, La Harpe, and many others of less note. The habit of analyzing language and ideas, which I acquired in the perusal of such works, soon led me to the French metaphysicians, especially Condillac."

The young gentleman is very angry with the ignorant theologians who would decry the metaphysics of materialism, or attempt to insinuate that man is a being composed of a spiritual soul and material body.

Page 289. "To acknowledge, on the authority of revelation, that mankind will rise from their graves, is not sufficient to protect the un-

fortunate metaphysician who should deny that man is a compound of two substances, one of which is naturally immortal."

That Bishop Kemp and his venerable associates may know the full extent of this gentleman's high rank as a divine, I shall exhibit the completion of his theological studies in his own words, in the *Letters of Doblado.*

Pages 298 and 299. "The first taste of mental liberty was more delicious than any feeling I ever experienced; but was suceeded by a burning thirst for every thing, that by destroying my old mental habits could strengthen it and confirm my unbelief. I gave an exhorbitant price for any French irreligious books, which the love of gain induced some Spanish book-sellers to import at their peril. The intuitive knowledge of one another, which persecuted principles impart to such as cherish them in common, made me soon acquainted with several members of my own profession, deeply versed in the Philosophical school of France. They possessed and made no difficulty to lend me all the anti-Christian works of the French press."

"Pretending studious retirement, I have fitted up a small room, to which none but my confidential friends find admittance. Here lie my prohibited books, in perfect concealment, in a well contrived nook under a stair case. The *Breviary* alone, in its black binding, clasps, and gilt leaves, is kept upon the table, to check the doubts of any chance intruder."

I could give other extracts, but these will suffice to shew what learning and especially what extensive theological knowledge the writer possessed. How then, it will be asked, did he rise to such an eminent place? My answer is, the place was not eminent: and that he got it in the manner which I have suggested he gives good reason to believe, for, in page 287 of his *Spanish Letters*, he states that those fellowships as he called them were obtained by partiality, and in page 288 he shews how they who had not interest to secure a strong party amongst the electors, could not offer themselves "as champions at those literary jousts."

The standing of the author as to grade, in the Roman Catholic Church, was therefore far from high. But of that I shall make no point; I shall treat him as if he was the most learned Pope that ever existed. There is another criterion besides knowledge and talent required in a witness: this writer coming forward to testify, must submit to the ordeal of examination upon the score of character. I know nothing more of him than is furnished by his own book; and upon his own statements I shall form my judgment.

He is the grandson of an Irish emigrant who was obliged to leave

Ireland and to take refuge in Spain, because of that code, whose principles the grandson of this refugee has returned from Spain to advocate. (p. 15). The author's father was sent to Ireland in his childhood for a time, that he might not lose the attachment to the land of his progenitors; and the son of that father returns to England to exhort the oppressors of his father's land to continue their oppression: to call upon the British Parliament in the name of the God of charity and justice to continue the fetters of political and civil persecution on the score of religion, upon the children of calumniated martyrs! ! ! His mother was a Spanish lady, whom he describes as decorated with every true virtue; of his parent he says, "It is enough to say that such were the purity, the benevolence, and the angelic piety of my father's life, that at his death, multitudes of people thronged the house to indulge a last view of the dead body. Nor was the wife of his bosom at all behind him either in fulness of faith or sanctity of manners." Yet they were rigid Roman Catholics! He informs us that his education was well attended to.

"At the age of fourteen, all the seeds of devotion which had been sown in my heart sprung up spontaneously. The pious practices which had been hitherto a task, were now the effort of my own choice. I became a constant attendant at the congregation of the Oratory, where pious young men, intended for the Church, generally had their spiritual directors. Dividing my time between study and devotion, I went through a course of philosophy and divinity at the University of Seville: at the end of which I received the Roman Catholic order of subdeacon."

From the above extract, page 16, one would imagine that a more immaculate and holy young gentleman had never taken orders. If his testimony be worth any thing, it will prove, that the education of a child of virtuous parents in the Roman Catholic Church, has not any taint by which virtue is contaminated by bad doctrine; it will prove that the education of candidates for holy orders in the Catholic Church is one which cultivates and develops the germs which the seeds of virtue shoots forth; our witness in his last letters has not made any charge of neglect of cultivating learning or Christian virtue upon the Roman Catholics, who have charge of educating youth. He gives a farther testimony on this subject in page 140, [where] he writes—

"A more blameless, ingenuous, religious set of youths than that in the enjoyment of whose friendship I passed the best years of my life, the world cannot boast of. Eight of us, all nearly the same age, lived in the closest bond of affection, from sixteen till one and twenty; and four at least, continued in the same intimacy till that of thirty-five. Of this knot of friends not one was tainted by the breath of gross vice, till

the Church had doomed them to a life of celibacy, and turned the best affections of their hearts into crime."

Upon this, all I shall remark is, that it supports the testimony before given that in the education, in the religious instruction, there was nothing but the highest purity and most perfect virtue; whether his crimes and those of his companions were caused by the obligation of celibacy is a different question. In page 143 he writes—

"I have seen the most promising men of my University obtain country vicarages, with characters unimpeached, and hearts overflowing with hopes of usefulness."

We have now from the reverend gentleman full testimony that the education was excellent and the demeanor virtuous and the disposition good, at the time of ordination. We have also his statement regarding himself, that from fourteen to twenty-five he was most virtuous. Page 18, he says his religious doubts began, but still he was pious, and prayed, and was devout, and they were dispelled. But to prove that unbelief does not always arise from immorality and levity, he assures us that his conscience did not then reproach him with any open breach of duty but those committed several years before. He does not vouchsafe to say how many years, but the gentleman was now in his twenty-sixth year, and he has informed us that in his childhood "no waywardness of disposition appeared in him to defeat or obstruct the labors of his parents to educate him in virtue," and that afterwards, to wit, from fourteen to this period, he and his companions were the most blameless and religious youths in the world. Still he had committed open breaches of duty several years before. Whichever side of this contradiction is true, matters very little; the conclusion is inevitable; the truth of both sides being irreconcileable, one of them must be false; and our witness has consequently under his own hand stated that which he must have known to be untrue. I shall not dwell longer on exhibiting the witness's self-contradiction, for of that abundance shall be furnished. I am now only examining his credibility as a moral man, and from his own disclosures. He exhibits himself as an imposter who would persuade the public that up to his twenty-fifth year he was blameless, religious, and virtuous, though he knew that several years before he had committed open breaches of duty.

We shall however now give the same Mr. White's testimony, upon the same subject, from another of his works. Speaking of his childhood, he writes in his *Letters from Spain*, in the *Magazine* volume 2:

Page 31. "The Church cannot be wrong, we know, but to say the honest truth, all her pious contrivances, have, by a sad fatality, pro-

duced in me just the reverse of what they aimed at. Though the clergyman who was to shrive this young sinner (himself at between seven and eight years of age) had mild, gentle and affectionate manners, there is something in auricular confession which has revolted my feelings from the first day I knelt before a priest, in childish simplicity, to the last time I have been forced to repeat that ceremony as a protection to my life and liberty, with scorn and contempt in my heart."

In page 32, he informs us, that at making his first communion, he was guilty of making it with the imaginary guilt of sacrilege for having made a bad confession; at fourteen, he made a good confession. He was intended for the counting-house, to which he took a disgust at the age of ten, and desiring to be a learned man, resolved to become a clergyman. His mother was pleased at this, because amongst other reasons, he would have no wife who would steal his affections from his parent. He does not say that his mother used the expression; but he thinks she must have had this motive. In page 161, he tells us that at the age of sixteen, father Vega, the superior of the Priests of the Oratory at Seville, discovered that one of the associates of Mr. White had prohibited books, and White being admonished to denounce this student of divinity; either his head or his heart, he knows not which, in spite of a frighted fancy, endued him with resolution to "baffle the blind zeal of his confessor." "The development of his reason saved him from sinking into the dregs of Aristoletic Philosophy." "The categories of St. Thomas were unsavory food for his mind, and he never opened the dismal book." In page 164, he finds in the second volume of Aristotelic *Natural Philosophy* of the Dominicans that the reason why water rises in a pump is the horror which nature has at being wounded and torn. (This is a discovery which no other person has had the happiness of being able to make during the last three hundred years.) He quarrels with his professor, leaves the college and goes to the university. In the former part of his letter I have shewn his account of his mode of studying theology. He had been the associate of a number of concealed infidels, and had totally neglected his studies, and baffled the blind zeal of his religious directors; left the old father Vega, and picked up a confessor more to his taste, who was his literary and spiritual director. He now gives us an account in his Spanish letters of his disposition for subdeaconship.

Page 293. "I will not describe the misery that embittered my youth and destroyed the peace of my maturer years, the struggles, perhaps the crimes, certainly remorse, that were the consequence of the barbarous laws of my country."

All this arose from Catholicism he assures us, because she did not

bring love to her side, but forced him into an inseparable league with immorality. We shall see the force. No one could compel him to enter upon a clerical state; and certainly neither his country nor the Church compelled him. He has already been a criminal, why should he now enter upon a state for which he knew himself to be unfit? Read what he says—

"Often did I recoil at the approach of the moment when I was to bind myself forever to the clerical profession, and as often my heart failed me at the sight of a mother in tears. It was not worldly interests —it was the eternal welfare of my soul which she believed to depend upon my following the call of heaven, that made the best of mothers a snare to her dearest child."

To this he adds the persuasions of the bad man whom he had chosen as a guide: and therefore, the law is bad, because a man who knows he ought not to enter upon the state, takes the advice of a man who he knew was misleading him, and acted against his conscience after other crimes, because his mother cried.

My friends; you will observe the innocent and studious young man going with fine dispositions to ordination: and the idle student who insults his teacher, neglects his regular studies, associates with infidels, is criminal in his conduct, insincere in his confession, selects the worst clergymen for his guides and binds himself to a state for which he has made himself unfit.

Mr. Blanco White has given you the two pictures of himself, it is for you to choose. I have only sketched the outline: when I shall have laid on all my colors, I shall be happy to receive Bishop Kemp's remarks.

Yours for the present,

B. C.

LETTER III.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 18, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends—I shall continue my examination of Mr. White's character, at some length; and that my object in so doing may be manifest, I shall inform you what it is; you will first bear with my stating to you what that object is not. I do not examine his character to vilify him, in exposing his faults, of which the best of us has enough, by way of retaliation for his deserting our Church, or for his having written a gross attack upon our tenets. I should despise myself were I capable of such misconduct: however deficient this priest might have been in ecclesias-

tical knowledge, his ignorance could not make good any practice of our Church, which in its own nature would be bad; however bereft of faith he might be, his infidelity could not make a foolish or vicious human invention become a part of the revelation, or institution of God, and how ever corupt or profligate his own conduct might have been, its criminality could not make the crimes of other profligates become virtues, nor could they be excused because of his wickedness. My object then, is not, by exhibiting the true character of Mr. White, to justify in our Church, practices which deserve condemnation; nor to excuse criminals of our communion, because he who denounces them has deserted our Church, and was himself a criminal; no, my object is to shew that the bare assertion of Mr. White is no evidence; and I believe that I shall effect this by proving that from his character as given by himself, he is totally unworthy of credit. This is my object in the very painful task which I am performing. I consider this to be very necessary, because the chief value attached to his publication arises from his being a credible witness of facts which he alleges to have been under his own observation.

I believe that I have fully shewn that neither from his rank, nor from his ecclesiastical information, does this priest deserve any of that extraordinary attention which Bishop Kemp and his Episcopalian, Presbyterian and Methodist associates so emphatically claim on his behalf. Mr. White's rank was that of a mere possessor of a benefice without the care of souls, having indeed a rank which pre-supposed some attainment of knowledge, a certificate of which attainment he could not obtain in the university where he was educated; but to effect his purpose he attained it at one of those places which by virtue of an old charter can grant to any one, and does grant to the unworthy what was intended to be given only to the learned. We see that he scarcely studied his treatises whilst he was attending the dull lectures on divinity; but that he read light works of taste, and subsequently devoured the anti-christian productions of the French school of infidelity. He in one book tells us of his innocence and his religion, whilst in another he avows his criminality; and even in this testimony of his innocence, the recollection of his misdeeds involuntarily escapes from him. He in one place appears to be filled with the spirit of virtue at the time of his ordination; and yet he testifies that it was against his will, and because his mother was bathed in tears, [that] he became an ecclesiastic. He bound himself to celibacy, because his mother cried; when he hated to bind himself, because if he did so he could not lawfully cherish love. Do not, my friends, do not turn away in disgust. It is unpleasant; but you must bear more if you will have correct information. I have as yet made no incision; I am only

marking the surface. It is necessary for you to view the subject, and to observe the dissection.

Mr. White having been ordained subdeacon, informs us, in his evidence against Catholicism, page 17, that upon his receiving his benefice about a year after his ordination to the priesthood, he felt it to be his duty "to devote his whole leisure to the study of religion." He adds, page 18, "I need not say that I was fully conversant with the system of Catholic divinity; for I owed my preferment to a public display of theological knowledge; yet I wished to become acquainted with all kinds of works which might increase and perfect that knowledge."

I have shown you what his studies were. Now allow me to say that the writer of these letters has made theology his principal study during twenty years; that he has had patience to study for, and to attend to the dull lectures of divinity professors; that his love for that study so far from being diminished, grows stronger every day, and that he still feels his deficiency to be so great, that although he knows much; he could not presume to say that now he is fully conversant with the system of Catholic divinity. It may be weakness on his part; but he never can hear any young man, let his attention to study have been ever so great, make such an assertion as Mr. White has here made, without at once looking upon him to be very superficially instructed, and impertinently vain: but in this man's case, how could he have been fully conversant with a system which he never studied? which he despised? Let us now from his other letters (Doblado's) take his own account of the interval between his receiving subdeaconship and his being ordained priest.

In my last letter I stated from his own words the very improper dispositions with which he approached to subdeaconship: allow me to exhibit to you his mode of preparing for priesthood.

Pages 293 and 294—

"Often did I recoil at the approach of the moment when I was to bind myself for ever to the clerical profession, and as often my heart failed me at the sight of a mother in tears. It was not worldly interests—it was the eternal welfare of my soul which she believed to depend upon my following the call of heaven that made the best of mothers a snare to her dearest child. The persuasions of my confessor, and above all, the happiness which I experienced in restoring cheerfulness to my family deluded me into the hope of preserving the same feeling through life. A very short time, however, was sufficient to open my eyes. The inexorable law that bound me was the bitterest foe to my virtue. Yet devotion had not lost her power over my fancy, and I broke loose more than once from

her thraldom, and was as often reclaimed, before the awful period which was to raise me to the priesthood."

In page 293, he tells us that his confessor "was a sound Catholic and a devout man," though in the preceding page he exhibits him to us, holding principles completely subversive of faith and devotion, and as having induced himself to read a work, which as the mind is prepared for its reading, is one of the best or one of the worst books which a theologian could study. But Mr. White was by no means sufficiently well informed to read it with advantage, and the consequences are plainly exhibited by him in page 293, "Vague fears and doubts haunted my conscience for many days," and again, "His abilities and affection to me had obtained a most perfect command over my mind, and it was not long before I could match him in mental boldness, on points unconnected with articles of faith." Thus, before he received subdeaconship the groundwork of infidelity was laid; and he had neglected a powerful remedy, his attention to dull divinity. This "sound Catholic and devout man," in pages 290, 291, 293, and 294 is, evidently, a covert infidel, who gradually sapped the faith of a club of unfortunate young men, of whom White was one; this is the confessor who permitted this young man to enter into a state for which by his contrivance he was thoroughly disqualified. I cannot avoid making one extract, to show their systematic progress. It may be useful, if for no other purpose than to show, if this letter should fall into the hands of young men who study religion, the great cause of infidelity; viz. the substitution of speculative theory, for evident fact.

"It was the favorite amusement of myself and those constant associates of my youth that formed the knot of friends, of whom the often mentioned *major collegian* was the center and guide, to examine all our feelings, in order to resolve them into some general law, and trace them to their simple elements. This habit of analysis and generalization extended itself to the customs and habits of the country, and the daily incidents of life, till in the course of time it produced in me the deceitful, though not uncommon notion, that all knowledge is the result of developed principles, and gave me a distaste for every book that was not cast into a regular theory."

"While I was thus amused and deceived by the activity of my mind, without endeavoring to give it the weight and steadiness which depends upon the knowledge of facts, Catholicism with its ten thousand rules and practices, was mechanically keeping up the ill-contrived structure of devotion, which it had raised more in my fancy than my heart. It had now to contend, however, with an enemy whom nothing but fixed

hope can keep within bonds—but religion had left me no hope. Instead of engaging love on her side, she had forced him into an inseparable league with immorality."

Now, with the materials before us, I shall give what I conceive the author of both sets of letters to have been, at the period of his ordination. I believe him to have been originally a well disposed youth, who, if he had fallen into proper hands might have been an intelligent, well-informed, and pious clergyman, though more brilliant than learned; or a useful member of society in some other station. But at an early period he indulged his vanity and was insincere in his declarations. Of this insincerity he repented, and his vanity would have been cured by God's grace and his own experience. Unfortunately however for him, he entered too early upon his more severe studies, than which perhaps a greater literary misfortune cannot occur; whilst his fancy might have been cultivated it was restrained: he became disgusted with the dry and abstruse treatises which were prematurely made his task. A covert infidel of ability, and taste, and ingenuity, who had disguised himself in a cassock, won his affections, indulged his taste, cultivated his fancy, misled his judgment, made him deceive and disobey his spiritual director, weaned him from his classes, seduced him to scepticism, and usurped the place of his confessor. He now was bereft of the religion of the heart, and adhered to external observances which became tiresome and disgusting, save when they amused the fancy. The young man himself did not suspect that his faith was undermined. At the age when he was most susceptible of love, he desires to abandon a state for which he is now totally disqualified; his treacherous guide urges him to undertake obligations from which he should have recoiled as he actually did, and the tears of a fond mother ignorant of the state of his soul, and his own desire of gratifying his family, come to aid those importunities. In contradiction to every principle of religion and prudence, he assumes the obligations of a state to which he was averse and for which he was disqualified. I believe Mr. White has no reason to complain of this view. If he has acted improperly in selecting and freely entering upon such a state of life, he has to blame his own indiscretion, not the laws of that state which he freely, though improperly and perhaps criminally undertook to observe.

Having freely entered upon the state, he ought to have observed its laws; and if he found any difficulty, that God, who always grants his aid to those who avoid temptation and have recourse, with proper dispositions, to prayer and to the sacraments, would have preserved him. But this gentleman is one of those beings whose ardent minds too often mis-

lead them; they believe momentary enthusiasm to to be the evidence of unshaken resolution; and passing excitement to be the lasting fervor of steady zeal; they rely upon their strength; they neglect precaution; and they quickly run from one extreme to another. Mr. White, before he became a subdeaeon, was a criminal deceived by the activity of his own mind, and having occasional remorse, page 293. He made an effort to prepare for orders, and indulged a hope of preserving some feeling of religion through life. But how could he? His faith was undermined—his heart lost all religious sentiment—devotion had some power over his fancy, page 294. But this is not religion; this forms no foundation for virtue; this is merely a delusion. He consequently finds the law of his state "a foe to his virtue," he breaks loose more than once, and as often is reclaimed before his elevation to the priesthood, page 294. This needs no explanation; but if it did, the next page furnishes it in abundance.

After describing, in page 294, another of those transitory illusions of his fancy; in page 295, describing his sentiments on the day of his ordination to the priesthood, and the celebration of his first mass, he has the following passage:

"I had still a heart it is true—a heart ready to burst at the sight of my parents on their knees, while impressing the first kiss upon my newly consecrated hands; but it was dead to the charms of beauty. Among the friendly crowds that surrounded me for the same purpose were those lips, which, but a few months before, I would have died to press; yet I could but just mark their superior softness."

I believe we need no more proof to convince us, that a more improper candidate for orders was seldom, if ever raised to the priesthood. Just reflect, my friends; you who know what we expect from our clergy, reflect upon the prospects of a man who makes love and infidelity his preparations for the priesthod; and whose mind, on the solemn day of his ordination, could indulge such thoughts as those here alluded to. Can you wonder that this man should become an apostate? Did Bishop Kemp read the *Letters of Doblado,* and compare the two accounts which his hero gives of himself, before he insults the Catholic Church by adducing this profligate man as a good specimen of her clergy? Is this the witness so eminently qualified to inform the world of the character of our Church.

Having been ordained priest, he received no benefice until nearly a year had elapsed, *Evidence* page 17. In page 18, he informs us that he now conceived himself bound to devote the whole of his leisure time to the study of religion. In his other letters, page 295, he tells us that, immediately after his ordination,

"To exercise the privileges of my office for the benefit of my fellow-creatures, was now my exclusive aim and purpose. I daily celebrated mass, with due preparation, preached often, and rejected none that applied to me for confession. The best ascetic writers of the Church of Rome were constantly in my hands. I made a study of the fathers; but, though I had the Scriptures among my books, it was, according to custom, more for reference than perusal. These feelings, this state of mental abstraction, is by no means uncommon, for a time, among young priests whose hearts have not been withered by a course of premature profligacy."

To me it is matter of perfect indifference which of those two incompatible assertions is the truth, or whether either is true. My own opinion is, that neither accords with the fact; but I will suppose him to have stated the truth in *Doblado's Letters*, as it will be giving him that position most favorable to himself. The question will then be, how long this course of study continued. He tells us, page 295, "I shall conclude my narrative, by faithfully relating the origin and progress of the total change which took place in my mind, within little more than a year after I had received priest's orders." This accords pretty well with the statement in page 18 of *The Evidence*, as to time. "My religious belief had hitherto been undisturbed; but light clouds of doubt began now to pass over my mind, which the warmth of devotion soon dissipated. Yet they would gather again and again, with an increased darkness which prayer would scarcely dispel." It is not, however, so easy to reconcile light clouds of doubt, soon dissipated, to a total change of mind; nor does this last agree with recurring darkness which prayer could scarcely dispel; nor can I reconcile this assertion, that his religious belief had been hitherto undisturbed with his statement, *Letters*, page 293, that even three or four years before, "vague fears and doubts haunted his conscience for many days." I care not which of those contradictions is the truth. My object is only to learn Mr. White's moral character, as a credible witness, from himself. He has now been exhibited up to the period when his settled infidelity is about to commence; and by comparing his account of himself in his *Evidence* against our Church, and that given by him in his *Letters of Doblado*, we perceive that nothing can be more natural than to calculate upon his infidelity, unless it should be prevented by a miracle of grace. And nothing is more palpable, than that much of what he wrote must to his own knowledge be totally untrue.

He states in both productions, that his unbelief was a consequence of the principles of our Church. This is not the time to examine that

assertion; we shall have it fully under our examination more than once hereafter. In pages 18 and 19 of his *Evidence* is the following passage:

"That immorality and levity are always the source of unbelief, the experience of my own case, and my intimate acquaintance with many others, enables me most positively to deny. As to myself, I declare most solemnly, that my rejection of Christianity took place at a period, when my conscience could not reproach me with any open breach of duty, but those committed several years before: that during the transition from religious belief to incredulity, the horror of sins against the faith, deeply implanted by education in my soul, haunted me night and day; and that I exerted all the powers of my mind to counteract the involuntary doubts, which were daily acquiring an irresistible strength. In this distress, I brought to remembrance all the arguments for the truth of the Christian religion, which I had studied in the French apologists. I read other works of the same kind; and having to preach, in the execution of my office, to the royal brigade of carbineers, who came to worship the body of St. Ferdinand, preserved in the king's chapel I chose the subject of infidelity, on which I delivered an elaborate discourse. But the fatal crisis was at hand. At the end of a year, from the preaching of this sermon, the confession is painful, indeed, yet due to religion itself—I was bordering on atheism."

I would merely ask Bishop Kemp, in this place, what he thinks of Mr. White's credibility in his assertion of purity of conscience? or, if his conscience did not reproach him, what sort of conscience must he have had? Again, I shall object to his evidence being received in respect to the feelings of others, whilst I am occupied in showing that he is not worthy of credit in testifying his own. In his *Letters,* page 297, he writes:

"The involuntary train, however, both of feeling and of thought, which was to make me break out in complete rebellion, had long been sapping the foundation of my faith, without my being aware that the whole structure nodded to its ruin."

In the same page, he gives us as full evidence, that not only was his faith during a long time in danger, but that it was actually destroyed:

"My heart sinks within me at the view of the interminable list of offenses, every one of which may finally plunge me into the everlasting flames. Everlasting! and why so? Can there be revenge or cruelty in the Almighty? Such were the harassing thoughts with which I wrestled day and night. Prostrate upon my knees, I daily prayed for deliverance; but my prayers were not heard. I tried to strengthen my faith, by reading Bergier, and some of the French apologists for Christianity. But

what can they avail a doubting Catholic? His system of faith is indivisible; whatever proves it all, proves absurdity. To argue with a doubting Catholic is to encourage and hasten his desertion. Chateaubriand has perfectly understood the nature of his task; and, by engaging the feelings and imagination in defence of his creed, has given it the fairest chance against the dry and tasteless philosophy of his countrymen. His book propped up my faith for a while."

With what feelings can the Right Reverend and reverend gentlemen exhibit as peculiarly worthy of belief, a man who so frequently and palpably contradicts himself?

Here is then the only proper explanation of his state of belief from under his own hand. What is the doubt which tortures him? Purgatory? No—Hell. And the Roman Catholic Church is not so complaisant as to be satisfied with Purgatory alone. Will Bishop Kemp allow Mr. White to strike out such doctrines as do not suit his taste? Will the Presbyterian and Methodist patrons of this *Book of Evidence* give up their doctrine of hell? The Roman Catholic Church taught this amongst other absurdities, and her faith was indivisible. Mr. White had long been prepared for this change; his conscience still recollected the "lips of superior softness," and all those desires to gratify which he "could have died;" that conscience recollected those "crimes," and that "remorse," the "misery that embittered youth," and why should God be cruel? Yet the Catholic Church could not give up one tittle. Is this witness to be credited, when he asserts that his infidelity was not the result of a troubled conscience? After the exhibition which he has made of himself, how could he assert as he does, page 20 of his *Evidence*, "When I examined the state of my mind previous to my rejecting the Christian faith, I cannot recollect any thing in it but what is in perfect accordance with that form of religion in which I was educated." In how many palpable contradictions has he not been detected? And yet this man is to be a witness against the Roman Catholic world! Nay, he is to testify against others also. Observe how kindly he treats his old Catholic friends, when compared with some of his American patrons. *Letters of Doblado*, page 30:

"Enthusiasm—that bastard of religious liberty, that vigorous weed of Protestantism—does not thrive under the jealousy of infallible authority. Catholicism, it is true, has in a few instances produced a sort of splendid madness; but its visions and trances partake largely of the tameness of a mind previously exhausted by fears and agonies meekly borne under the authority of a priest. The throes of the new birth harrow up the mind of a Methodist, and give it all that phrenzied energy of

despair, which often settles into the all-hoping, all-daring raptures of the enthusiast."

What say his Methodist patrons to this? I shall now close this letter with a statement of our progress. This redoubtable witness in his account of himself in his *Evidence against Catholics* exhibits for himself to us, the picture of a well-disposed, pure, ingenuous, religious youth, led through the path of virtue and learning to the altar, but becoming an infidel because of the absurdities of Catholicism. In *Doblado's Letters* he exhibits himself the victim of infidelity, and a gross criminal, totally disqualified in a moral, religious, and literary point of view, for the state of life which he embraces; the profligate companion of profligate infidels, yet not totally bereft of all learning to faith, until about a year after his ordination. Already his character as a witness against the Catholic Church is lower than despicable; but as yet we do not see him as low as he must appear. Yours, B. C.

LETTER IV.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends:—I have disposed for the present of Mr. White's claims to ecclesiastical rank, ecclesiastical information, youthful piety, ordinary purity, and religious feeling. That is, in other words, I have shown you, from his own writings, that he was by no means a man of theological knowledge or of respectable rank; I have shown you that he exhibits himself to us an insincere, youthful profligate, who entered into orders with every improper disposition, and who lost his faith because of his having taken the most effectual means for its destruction; I have also shown you that his mind rejected, not the special doctrines of the Catholic Church, but the doctrine of the existence of hell, which I suppose is held by Bishop Kemp and the Reverend Mr. Post, to be good Protestant and Presbyterian doctrine. Of course one would now suppose this gentleman would leave the ministry, and not pocket money for doing that which he must condemn as imposture. Such would have been the advice of St. Paul, and such was his practice—even this principle regulated the practice of the Martyrs; such is the principle which the Roman Catholic Church enforces; but it would indeed be a very extraordinary presumption on our part to expect, that Mr. White, now discovering Catholicism to be imposture, should act upon Catholic principles. We must not look for it. No, Mr. White will aid the imposture and take that money to which he has no title. In a Catholic, this would be a crime, but in Mr. White, it would probably be reckoned a virtue. A Catholic who would

confess that he acted thus, would be obliged, before he could obtain absolution, to refund all this ill-gotten pelf to the Church which he had plundered: but as Mr. White thinks confession to be folly, if he went to the tribunal, as he insinuates he did, he either concealed his crimes; or again disobeyed his confessor; or to deceive his superiors, he went to some infidel with whom he was leagued, to add still more to his hypocrisy. In page 22, he writes,

"To describe the state of my feelings when believing religion a fable, I still found myself compelled daily to act as a minister and promoter of imposture, is beyond my powers. An ardent wish seized me to fly from a country where the law left me no choice between death and hypocrisy. But my flight would have brought my parents with sorrow to the grave."

Upon reading this, one would at all events say, the man is a hypocrite of the very worst description by his own avowal. But his love for his parents keeps him in this state, because of the cruelty of his government; thus, at least, though we cannot justify his "ten years' continuance of daily hypocrisy," we must palliate it. I will admit no such excuse for Mr. White, because nothing can palliate hypocrisy. The martyrs of Christ, that is, his witnesses, were not hypocrites; they laid down their lives for truth. Mr. White, our Protestant martyr, declares he has no such disposition, and I believe him in this.

I cannot then rank him with the ancient martyrs. Mr. White's grandfather made sacrifices for truth, and if this priest inherited the virtues of his house, he would not be a hypocrite, and a hypocrite who deliberately every day, during ten years, was the promoter of imposture.

It is a fair principle of commentary upon the testimony of such a man, to take all his acknowledgements of guilt to the full meaning of the words which he deliberately uses. He has avowed himself to have been during ten years in the daily practice of "promoting imposture," that during this time he was a "hypocrite," page 22. What degree of credit is due to a man who thus describes himself, it is for those who receive his testimony to determine; for my own part, if I was upon a jury to decide in any ordinary case which might come before a court; and one of the witnesses made such an avowal respecting himself, I would, in considering the case, discharge his testimony from my view altogether. Would any person give it full credit? I shall only say of Mr. White at present, that his testimony in his own favor is of an extremely equivocal character, and not to be admitted without extraordinary scrutiny and strong corroboration.

He says that he continued to be guilty of hypocrisy and imposture, because there was no other mode left to him by the barbarous laws of his country to save his life, except one which would bring down his parents to the grave with sorrow. In the first place this is nothing short of a plain untruth. If he resigned his clerical office, as very many persons of eminent piety have done, he need neither leave his parents, nor expose himself to that death of which he stood so much in terror. In such a case he would cease to promote what he calls imposture, and he could continue to soothe his parents. But if the gentleman made this resignation, where would he have the means of support? An honest man, a man who has any feeling of conscience, never asks such a question. If our witness then kept his office by which he was obliged "daily to promote imposture," in order to have the means of support, the result is inevitably: that our informant continued during ten years to be a hypocrite, and an impostor, for his support. Good God! what a witness has the conclave of discordant divines produced against Catholicism! ! ! Painful as is the alternate between want and systematic imposture, the wretch who is brought to receive sentence for his crime under a verdict of guilt in our courts, may indeed plead the temptations of want to mitigate the severity of the sentence. Humanity will shed a tear, and mercy will sue with justice to alleviate the infliction which the laws of God and man require. But Mr. White cannot have even this excuse, unless he was guilty of deliberate fraud at the time of his ordination. His first benefice was that which he calls a fellowship in the college of St. Mary a Jesu, at Seville: because though as unlike as was the frog to the ox, it would have the bloated appearance of the dignity of a fellowship of one of the Oxford Colleges, and our witness would have the semblance of erudition. Previously to this he had been ordained subdeacon, page 17. In Spain he could not have received this order as a secular, unless he had exhibited to the Bishop or to his official, his good title to a benefice, or to a fixed patrimonial or personal property fully sufficient to support him as a clergyman; and on the day of his ordination he must have been solemnly called to come forward for ordination upon the ground of that special title. Mr. White was a secular, without a benefice, and consequently must have been ordained upon the title of his patrimonial property fixed upon him, and to which he had a good legal and equitable claim, or having a good personal property: he then must have been guilty of gross fraud upon the very day of his ordination, or he could not have been driven by want to the necessity of being a hypocrite and an impostor, who repeated those crimes daily during ten years. I leave to the Right Reverend Doctor Kemp, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal

Church of Maryland, and to his Reverend associates to select which side they please of the alternative; but one or the other they must inevitably take. I believe the gentlemen will hardly contest with me now the truth of my assertion that their witness, who must have known his own motives, was guilty of a falsehood, when he asserted, that his filial affection and the cruel laws of his country, left him no alternative; that it became necessary for him to be an impostor and a hypocrite.

To catch such a man as this in trifling fibs, is only to pluck a leaf from a forest: still there are some falsehoods which for their very appearance will be sufficient to arrest our observation. Mr. White is continually forcing upon our attention, his fine feelings of family affection. It may not be amiss to examine a few specimens. I have drawn you to view his hypocrisy by his insinuating that he was an impostor out of respect to his parents; the same motive he says, made him take orders when he knew that he ought not. In a word, nothing was wrong in his whole conduct which did not flow from affection for some one of his family.

In page 15, of his *Evidence*, he tells us that he "hallowed the pages of another work (*Letters from Spain*, by Don Leucadio Doblado), with the character of his parents,"—"that such were the purity, the benevolence and the angelic piety of his father's life, that at his death, multitudes of people thronged the house to indulge the last view of the dead body." In page 29, of *Doblado's Letters* he tells us of his father: "under these unpromising circumstances (pecuniary losses) he married his mother, who if she could add but little to her husband's fortune, yet brought him a treasure of love and virtue, which he found constantly increasing, till death removed him on the first approaches of old age." In page 151, of his *Evidence*, he tells us of a younger sister, "at the age of twenty she left an infirm mother to the care of servants and strangers, and shut herself up in a convent." Of course if the old gentleman was not living, and her good son Joseph, what a profanation of the name of two venerable patriarchs! would not look after her, she was left only to servants and strangers. Mr. White gives us the account of his hearing his sister's confession after she became a nun, and she was in the convent when he left Spain. In page 26, this affectionate son is nearly heart-broken at the separation from that father when he was leaving Spain, and the more so, as the old gentleman was now bending I suppose, with age and grief. "I was too well aware of the firmness of my resolutions, not to endure the most agonizing pain when I irrevocably crossed the threshold of my father's house, and when his bending figure disappeared from my eyes, at the first winding of the Guadalquiver, down which I sailed. Heaven knows that time has not had power to

heal the wounds which this separation has inflicted on my heart." This is that same Mr. White who knew the firmness of his resolutions, but yet who took orders against his resolution because this mother was in tears: the same Mr. White who practiced systematic fraud, robbery, and hypocrisy daily during ten years, lest his "flight would have brought his parents with sorrow to the grave." But when the passages are placed in juxta-position who can tell how the dead father came to life, or the living father was dead, and his wife left to the care of only servants and strangers? But this is not my object. I suppose all this reconcilable. I only wish to know whether Mr. White had this filial affection, and whether it was necessary to be a hypocrite in order to save his parents from sinking with grief into the grave.

This affectionate son has shamefully treated his virtuous parents in his *Doblado's Letters*. In page 29, he indeed informs us,

"My mother was of honorable parentage. She was brought up in that absence of mental cultivation which prevails to this day, among the Spanish ladies. But her natural talents were of a superior cast. She was lively, pretty, and sang sweetly. Under the influence of a happier country, her pleasing vivacity, the quickness of apprehension, and the exquisite degree of sensibility which animated her words and actions, would have qualified her to shine in the most elegant and refined circles."

Of his father, he says, page 29, *Doblado's Letters*,

"Benevolence prompted all my father's actions; endued him, at times, with something like supernatural vigor; and gave him, for the good of his fellow-creatures, the courage and decision he wanted in whatever concerned himself. With hardly any thing to spare, I do not recollect a time when our house was not a source of relief and consolation to some families of such as, by a characteristic and feeling appellation, are called among us the blushing poor. In all seasons, for thirty years of his life, my father allowed himself no other relaxations, after the fatiguing business of his counting house, than a visit to the general hospital of the town—a horrible scene of misery, where four or five hundred beggars are at a time allowed to lay themselves down and die, when worn out by want and disease. Stripping himself of his coat, and having put on a coarse dress for the sake of cleanliness, in which he was scrupulous to a fault, he was employed, till late at night, in making the beds of the poor, taking the helpless in his arms, and stooping to such services as even the menials in attendance were often loath to perform. All this he did of his own free will, without the least connection, public or private, with the establishment. Twice he was at death's door from the contagious influence of the atmosphere in which he exerted his

charity. But no danger would appal him, when engaged in administering relief to the needy. Foreigners, cast by misfortune into that gulf of wretchedness, were the peculiar objects of his kindness."

In page 30, after describing his father, he adds:

"The principle of benevolence was not less powerful in my mother; but her extreme sensibility made her infinitely more susceptible of pain than pleasure—of fear than hope—and for such characters, a technical religion is a source of distracting terrors. Enthusiasm—that bastard of religious liberty, that vigorous weed of Protestantism—does not thrive under the jealous eye of infallible authority. Catholicism, it is true, has in a few instances, produced a sort of splendid madness; but its visions and trances partake largely of the tameness of a mind previously exhausted by fears and agonies, meekly borne under the authority of the priest. The throes of the new birth harrow up the mind of the Methodist, and give that phrenzied energy of despair, which often settles into the all-hoping, all-daring raptures of the enthusiast. The Catholic saint suffers in all the passiveness of blind submission, till nature sinks exhausted, and reason gives way to a gentle visionary madness. The natural powers of my mother's intellect were strong enough to withstand, unimpaired, the enormous and constant pressure of religious fears, in their most hideous shape. But, did I not consider reason the only gift of heaven, which fully compensates the evils of this present existence, I might have wished for its utter extinction, in the first and dearest object of my natural affection. Had she become a visionary, she had ceased to be unhappy. But she possessed to the last an intellectual energy equal to any exertion, except one, which was not compatible with the influence of her country—that of boldly looking into the dark recess where lurked the phantoms that harassed and distressed her mind."

He then adds of both:

"It would be difficult, indeed, to choose two fairer subjects for observing the effects of the religion of Spain. The results, in both, were lamentable, though certainly not the most mischievous it is apt to produce. In one, we see mental soberness and good sense degraded into timidity and indecision—unbounded goodness of heart, confined to the lowest range of benevolence. In the other, we mark talents of a superior kind, turned into the ingenious tormentors of a heart, whose main source of wretchedness was an exquisite sensibility to the beauty of virtue, and an insatiable ardor in treading the devious and thorny path it was made to take for the 'way which leadeth unto life.' A bolder reason, in the first, it will be said, and a reason less flattered by sensibility in the

second, would have made those virtuous minds more cautious of yielding themselves up to the full influence of ascetic devotion."

Is this, then the affection of a son for his fond parents? Has that man a heart, who seeks to degrade religion by mocking the virtues of his amiable family? Can that man have a sense of religion, who violates the command of heaven, and vents his malice against the Church of his youth, by dishonoring the authors of his being, and publishing what even a less ferocious enemy to them who gave him birth, would call the interesting weakness of their virtue, but what this parricide of family honor publishes as the criminality of their religion? Yet we shall find this man, in several places, put on the semblance of affection to cry out against a tribunal which, he says, obliges the parents to denounce their criminal children, though his hand has struck through both his parents, to endeavor to plunge his dagger into their Church! Yet, see what a picture he has drawn of that father; occupied in the work of devoted charity, whilst probably his wretched son was sneering, with his infidel companions, at the religion which gave such heroism; or ruining that innocence which, tainted and degraded by criminals like him, was to find its last earthly refuge in that hospital, and the last consolations from that clergy whose name he has disgraced, and whose fame he has libelled. Can this man have family affection? Not content with dishonoring his parents, he betrays his sister; or he has added to the catalogue of his falsehoods, and mocked the best feelings of the human heart. I believe the latter to be the fact. No brother could have written as he does in page 151 of his *Evidence*. Had he a sister in the state that he describes, he could not have heard her confession, as I shall afterwards show, by the strongest evidence; and if he could, neither as a priest, as a brother, or a man, could he have published to the world the disease of her conscience, of which he had been informed under the solemn pledge of religion, of affection, of honor, and of confidence in the most inviolable secrecy. No person can for a moment, reflect upon the statement without concluding, that it is the foul fabrication of a man bereft of all feeling of affection; or if by chance this is not the fact, the alternative is worse. He has betrayed the confidence of his sister, and published the weakness of her conscience to the world. Like a practical dealer in fable, he has acquired the knack of killing off his sisters, his parents and his friends, as they cease to excite interest; he has, however, bungled the mode of getting rid of his father. But no, I cannot—nature herself will not allow me, when such a man as this is before me—I will not unbend from my indignation and disgust, to exhibit him to ridicule.

Mr. White weeps for that sister! As we have nothing but the succession of tears, it will be as well to admit more.

In page 73 of the Evidence is the following passage:

"I too 'had a mother,' and such a mother, as did I possess the talents of your great poet ten-fold, they would have been honored in doing homage to the powers of her mind and the goodness of her heart. No woman could love her children more ardently, and none of those children was loved more vehemently than myself. But the Roman Catholic creed had poisoned in her the purest source of affection. I saw her during a long period, unable to restrain her tears in my presence. I perceived that she shunned my conversation, especially when my university friends drew me into any topics above those of domestic talk. I loved her, and this behavior cut me to the heart. In my distress, I applied to a friend, to whom she used to communicate all her sorrows; and to my utter horror, I learned that she suspected my anti-Catholic principles. My mother was distracted by the fear, that she might be obliged to accuse me to the Inquisition, if I incautiously uttered some condemned proposition in her presence. To avoid the barbarous necessity of being the instrument of my ruin, she could find no other means but that of shunning my presence."

The good old lady must have been a better theologian than was her son, or than he is at present; and must be qualified to fill one of the chairs of dull divinity, if she could so easily detect a condemned proposition; or else Mr. White must have been openly and glaringly anti-Catholic in his expressions. Why need he remain then a deliberate impostor, detained by filial affection, "until the approach of Bonaparte's troops to Seville enabled him to quit Spain, without exciting suspicion as to the real motive which tore him for ever from everything that he loved?" More than suspicion had been excited. Affection and honesty would have warned him to the same course.

If Mr. White's mother shunned his presence, and saw him only with tears, because she feared he would speak, and she would denounce him to the Inquisition, would it not be a greater alleviation to her grief, that he should be out of the reach of this tribunal? Was it then affection which detained him to practice imposture ten years? Was it affection that kept him in view of that mother, who shunned his presence, whom he forced to tears?

I have done with dissecting his heart, to search for what, if it ever contained, it must have been long void of—affection for his family. My soul has been oppressed during the operation. I have risen from it with feelings which no one need envy. I have been intimately acquainted

with the base and the profligate: they have unfolded their secrets to me; the assassin has led me through his history of crime; in the dead of the night, and in the depth of his dungeon, the murderer of his own child has turned away from viewing the innocent companion of her upon whom he once doted, but afterwards slew, to pour the story of his woe into my ear. I have recalled to memory what I knew of their affections. I have compared it with what I believe Mr. White's to be. I must unhesitatingly aver, that if that man's family affection, and that of the worst of those, were weighed against each other, I doubt whether that worst had less than I believe him to possess. Though they were great criminals, no one of them attempted to palliate his own crime by defaming even the victim which he slew. In my estimation, this hypocrite is below any of them; and I can only say, that there is but one alternative which can bestow upon him a claim to any semblance of affection, and which I hope is the fact: that is, that a considerable portion of his narrative is fiction. I think I shall easily prove much of it to be palpably false. But yet the man had at least a father and a mother. He tells us that he hallowed the pages of a book by the record of their virtues; and then tells us those virtues, became the fears of superstitious weakness, and the publication of [this] weakness to the world, in order to enslave his father's father's country, is the filial affection of the Reverend Joseph Blanco White! ! ! Come, Bishop Kemp, take this man to your bosom—cherish him who stung his mother—embrace him whose fangs have not spared his father—hold forth to your flock, as a model of affection, the reptile who has bedaubed his sister. Doctor Wilmer recognizes in him some congeniality of feeling, as regards the ancient Church; the Reverend Mr. Hawley is too modest to march in front to the attack; but covered by you both, he believes himself secure. Before I close my examination of this apostate priest, I shall convince even you, if you do not already know it, that he is as completely at variance with the doctrines of the Church of England as he is with mine. I have already shown, that he likes Methodists as little. I assure you, your Presbyterian associates shall have no victory. Why then did you bring him forward? My friends, this Right Reverend Gentleman and his associates shall get Mr. White's character more fully developed in my next.

Yours, B. C.

LETTER V.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 2, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends—The occupations of men are of such a nature, as generally to require from each individual his principal, if not his exclusive attention to some one study or employment; and as the human mind is extremely limited in its faculties, it must generally happen that they who are deeply engaged in any one department, can be only imperfectly acquainted with all others. The common sense of mankind and the experience of ages and of nations, has therefore established the general maxim, that the best judge of any science or art, is a person who has made that science, or that art his principal study. The great body of mankind will observe any glaring defect, or monstrous irregularity in a public building; others will frequently feel, even where no palpable error is seen, that something is amiss, in the appearance, though they cannot particularize the fault; but a skilful architect not only perceives the want of symmetry, but can specify the exact seat and the extent of the blunder; and few if any, save they who are conversant with the object of the structure and the details of the business for which it is to be employed, can say whether its apartments are judiciously and conveniently laid out. Probably, upon this principle, we may excuse the commendators of Blanco White, except for their uncalled for interference.

Bishop Kemp and his associates, are pleased to call our religion, "a wonderful system." And so it is. It is a system deriving its origin from the Deity, who first planted it in the human heart; he enabled our great parent in the first development of his understanding to discover the only principle which this whole system comprises, man is bound to adore his creator. Yes, my friends! this is the only principle of our Church; this is the summary of our religion. This was discovered by Adam in the day of his innocence; and it was recollected by Adam in the midst of the gloom which succeeded to his fall; it was transmitted by him as the most valuable legacy to his children. Patriarchal tradition preserved it to the days of the deluge. It remained with Noe in the Ark; and it came forth to cheer him in the midst of the desolation with which he was surrounded upon the hills of Armenia; he beheld its calm and peaceful beauty in the rainbow; it preserved his faith at the bloody sacrifice, and enkindled his hope when the holocaust was consumed upon the blazing altar. It was misapplied and misdirected at Babel; and the roaming outcasts who were spread over the face of the earth, still in their migration preserved the principle though they mistook the object of adoration.

But the young Chaldean who came out from his father's house and from his kindred, brought it with him in purity, to the land of strangers which was to be given as an inheritance to his descendants; in the valley of vision and upon the hill of sacrifice, he conversed with the God of his fathers, who gave to him ordinances calculated to preserve the principle from the corruptions of human speculation. That God went down with Joseph into Egypt, and after exhibiting his might by the hand of Moses, he brought his people through the yawning valley of the Red Sea. In the midst of wonders he proclaimed his law, and gave its sanction at Sinai. He established then a priesthood and a tribunal for the careful preservation of that original principle which the varying speculations of restless men had so disguised throughout the world, as to make the objects of their adoration every real vice and every imaginary virtue; as well as every material being, from the glorious sun of Persia to the putrid leek of Egypt. Again at the appointed time; the heavens were rent; the great teacher descended, an incarnate God wrought wonders in Judea; the Sun of Justice succeeded to that orb which had only announced his glories by reflection: the twinkling prophets were lost in the brilliancy of his light. The new tribunal is established, that tribunal whose commission was extended to every nation, and all days to the end of time. In wonders, the Apostles go forth to victory, and to death. In wonders, the world is convinced that God has directed how the great principle should be carried into practice. But the human mind is restless, and speculation again misleads from the evidence of fact: man begins to inquire how can God do those things, instead of inquiring whether he has proof of God's declaration that he has done them. Separations are made, nations fall away, new nations are converted, empires are overturned, kingdoms are destroyed, death sweeps dynasties from their thrones, their monuments vanish at the touch of time; oblivion blots their names from the memories of men: ages have passed away, everything else is new, save that system which in the midst of wonders the Son of God has permanently established: all the old separatists have dwindled to almost shadows; but others of a different kind have succeeded; every civilized nation has embraced the system, and in every civilized nation has it been opposed and persecuted; and still in every age its adherents form the vast majority of the civilized portion of the human race. It began in wonders, it has been established by wonders, it has been propagated by wonders, its wonders are seen now, even now, amongst ourselves, even before the eyes of the originators of the libel against which I write. The very perpetuation of the system is a wonder, and will continue so to be, until time shall be no more. Well then have

our opponents described ours as a wonderful system. I feel happy that in this at least we are agreed.

But in describing the parts of this wonderful system; he who is but slightly acquainted with them is liable to err. When Mr. White has entered upon this description, he has exhibited to us at once his rashness, his malice and his disregard of truth. Those my friends are very serious charges, and very strongly expressed; I can, however, by the abundance of proof, justify my assertion, or I would not thus deliberately make it. In looking over his pages, no Protestant, not even Bishop Kemp, nor Doctor Hawley, nor any other of the zealous gentlemen who volunteered his own exposure, is capable of forming an opinion as to Mr. White's credibility upon those topics. Those gentlemen have never studied either the system of the theology or canon law of the Catholic Church; they are as little qualified to give an opinion upon the merits of the work as they are to explain the composition of the ring of Saturn. I write this without disrespect, I write it, with deep regret that a sense of duty compels me to expose them, for my own protection. The general body of Roman Catholics may feel, in reading the work, that it is a foul, slanderous misrepresentation; but, except to persons who have made the canons and usages of the Church their study, the greater portion of its falsehood will not be specially evident. To endeavor by the exhibition of a few of the most gross misstatements of this sort to exhibit Mr. White as altogether regardless of truth, will require from me a minute reference to some laws, customs and decisions of the Catholic Church, in full force in Spain, which may have the appearance of pedantry, and will be altogether a different description of style from that which the subject would appear to demand. I however have formed my opinion, which is, that my case will be best sustained, and Mr. White best exposed by this mode. I shall therefore follow it at present.

Mr. White tells us in page 151, of his *Evidence* respecting a young sister,

"At the age of twenty she left my infirm mother to the care of servants and strangers, and shut herself up in a convent, where she was not allowed to see even the nearest relations."

"Disease soon filled her conscience with fear and I had often to endure the torture of witnessing her agonies at the confessional."

Of his eldest sister he tells us, page 150,

"I saw my eldest sister at the age of two and twenty, sink slowly into the grave within the walls of a convent."

"I saw her on her death bed. I obtained that melancholy sight at

the risk of bursting my heart, when in my capacity of priest, I heard her last confession."

Page 144. "The picture of female convents requires a more delicate peneil: yet I eannot find tints suffieiently dark and gloomy to pourtray the miseries which I have witnessed in their inmates. Crime indeed makes its way into those recesses, in spite of the spiked walls, and prison gates whieh protect the inhabitants. This I know with all the certainty which the self accusation of the guilty, can give."

That those guilty who made this self-accusation, which gave him the certainty, were the nuns, is plain from the succeeding passage—

"It is besides a notorious fact, that the nunneries of Estremadura and Portugal, are frequently infected with vice of the grossest kind. But I will not dwell on this revolting part of the picture. The greater part of the nuns, whom I have known were beings of a mueh higher description—females whose purity owed nothing to the strong gates and high walls of the cloister, and so forth."

One more passage is all that I shall now quote to plaee this side of the case upon its proper ground, pages 138, 139 and 140.

"Of monks and friars, I know comparatively very little, because the vague suspicions, of whieh even the most pious Spanish parents eannot divest themselves, prevented my frequenting the interior of monasteries during my boyhood. My own judgment, and the general disgust whieh the prevailing grossness and vulgarity of the regulars ereate in those who daily see them, kept me subsequently away from all intercourse with the cowled tribes: but of the secular elergy, and the amiable life prisoners of the Church of Rome, few if any ean possess a more intimate knowledge than myself. . .

"The intimacy of friendship, the undisguised converse of saeramental eonfession, opened to me the hearts of many, whose exterior eonduct might have deceived a common observer. . . Sueh are the sourees of the knowledge I possess: God, sorrow, and remorse are my witnesses."

From those passages the obvious conclusion may be embodied in the following propositions, viz.

1. That Mr. White had no intercourse with the regulars, that is with monks or friars.

2. That few if any persons knew more intimately than he did, the true state of the nuns.

3. That he derived his knowledge from the undisguised converse of saeramental eonfession, and from the intimacy of friendship.

4. That common observers might be deceived by exterior conduct, but from his peculiar opportunities he could not be so easily deceived.

5. That in spite of walls and spikes, and so forth, nuns are criminals: of which he has all the certainty which the self-accusation of the guilty can give.

6. That he calls God to witness that what he discloses is derived from those sources.

7. That the greater number of the nuns whom he knew were females of purity.

My friends.—You are disgusted!—I solemnly assure you that in a life of many trials, I have never suffered more exquisite torture than I do, at being obliged to write in the manner, and upon the topic which this wretched man, and his——yes, I will use the epithet, uninformed, compurgators have forced upon me. It has been my lot, in the discharge of duty, to bury myself amidst the worst offscourings of immorality. I have had during years to be made familiar with loathsome disease and moral turpitude. You can scarcely name a moral or a physical plague, with which I have not come in contact. I have shrunk from none of these: but I do avow it; I shrink back from Blanco White and Bishop Kemp, and their heartless associates! ! ! But truth and justice require of me to proceed. Away then with feelings—I shall do it.

This miserable man next asserts:

8. That he heard the confession of his eldest sister on her deathbed.

9. That his younger sister shut herself up in a convent where she was not allowed to see her nearest relations.

10. That he *often* heard her confession.

11. That to him it was a torture to witness her agonies at the confessional, because of the fears with which her conscience was filled.

Now of those eleven propositions, seven must of necessity be palpable and deliberate falsehoods, two others are the most improbable which I can conceive, and the other two, viz. those marked 1 and 7, may be true.

It requires no depth of theological learning to perceive the truth of the following principles. 1. The person who imagining, even under delusion, that she is obliged by the law of God to reveal what nothing but obedience to that law could induce her to reveal, makes to her brother under that impression a declaration which she is persuaded no torture could drag from him, when he is pledged by every tie which heaven and earth hold solemn, to the most inviolable secresy; has upon him the highest possible claim to preserve that secrecy, and should he

violate it, and thereby expose the weakness of his sister! ! can there be upon earth a more mean and contemptible and wicked wretch? 2. Suppose the whole system of the Catholic religion to be erroneous and delusive: is there not a bond which nothing can loose, upon him who receives from a deluded being, whom his office brought to disclose to him the troubles of her soul, that he shall preserve her secrets, though he and she were in error when she confided in him? If he betrays them, ought he ever be received into society? The betrayer of a sister's religious confidence! ! !—Could White have had a sister? Impossible! ! !—or he knew not how a brother ought to feel!—A brother in such a situation!—It is folly to imagine one syllable of truth in the whole narrative. Nature contradicts the self-accusing hypocrite, the avowed impostor! Religion unites with nature in the disclaimer—a sister to confess to her brother is next to unheard of in the Church of God. In the medical profession, there is a creditable delicacy which is a counterpart to what exists in our Church. The intimacy of family connexion often requires from delicate minds that a stranger shall be the depositary of some secrets, the witness of some weaknesses, the healer of some imperfections; and the heartless being who could make himself master of his sister's religious terrors, in the station of her confessor, and publish them to the world contrary to every law of the Church, of nature, and of God, is only to be equalled by him who—— No, there is not a miscreant on this earth of so deep a stain of iniquity. I shall rescue the remnant of this man's character from his own malevolence by proving that he had it not in his power to be as great a wretch as he pretends he was.

The law of the Church was in full vigor in Spain at the time to which he alludes.

Mr. White tells us, page 189, of his *Evidence*, "at the age of five and thirty, religion, and religion alone, tore him away from his country."

Now I assert, that in Spain he never could have been a confessor to a convent of nuns, and therefore that he was not: and consequently, he called God to witness a foul falsehood in page 140 of his *Evidence*.

In *Doblado's Letters*, volume 3, *Magazine*, page 321, Mr. White describes convents, particularly those of Seville. No person who had a particle of delicate feeling could have written some of the passages contained in this letter. Take one of the least objectionable as a specimen:

"But I cannot discover the least shadow of reason or interest for the obstinacy which preserves unaltered the barbarous laws relating to the religious vows of females; unless it be that vile animal jealousy which

persons deprived of the pleasures of love, are apt to mistake for the zeal of chastity: such zeal as your Queen Elizabeth felt for the purity of her maids."

He calls the convents "*Bastilles* of superstition where many a victim lingers through a long life of despair or insanity." He then describes the nunneries as of two kinds, those under the jurisdiction of the Bishop, and those under the jurisdiction of the Friars: the first he says are comfortable: the latter horrible; of the latter, there are some which are Reformed, in those, page 322, the nuns see and converse with their parents once a month. "The religious vows of the Capuchin nuns however, put a final end to all communication between parents and children." As he informs us that his younger sister "shut herself up in a convent, where she was not allowed to see her nearest relations," she must have become a Capuchin nun. The Capuchins are one of the regular orders—in regular nunneries no priest often hears the confession of a nun except the regular, ordinary confessor. By a regulation of the 10th Chapter, Session xxv, of the Council of Trent, an extraordinary confessor must sit to hear them three or four times in the year. Mr. White had no one qualification, save his priesthood, to make him eligible either as ordinary or extraordinary confessor of a Capuchin nunnery. It was decided by the Sacred Congregation of Cardinals in the affairs of Bishops and Regulars, (or friars) which is the competent judicial tribunal in such cases, on four several causes:

1st. That the nuns could not elect their confessor.

2d. That the Bishop was to appoint the confessor for the converts subject to him.

3d. That the regular prelates, that is, friars, were to appoint confessors for the nuns of their own order.

Those decisions were made, in a case from Loretto, on the 20th of September, 1588; in a case from Tusculum, on the 15th of October, 1601; in a case from Riga, on the 4th of September, 1602; and in a case from Valladolid, on the 26th of October, in the same year. Now, he assures us himself, that he had no intercourse with the cowled tribes, and yet he wishes us to believe that the most rigid, and of course to him, the most hateful of those tribes gave to him that place to which they always appointed the most virtuous and respectable men of their own order!!! I suspect this is a sort of reasoning which Bishop Kemp will not understand, but to a person conversant with the laws and customs of the Catholic Church, Mr. White's assertion will appear the most absurd and preposterous.

In the second place this man is a secular priest; now by a multi-

tude of canons and decisions, it has been regulated and is an universal custom, that the confessor of a nunnery of a regular order generally is, and ought to be, a friar of the same order. To this rule there is but one exception in such a place as Seville, and this exception could scarcely occur: viz. That the community of nuns could not be prevailed upon to confess to a friar of their own order. But this must be for the community, not for an individual, as was decided by the congregation in a case from Palermo, May 27, 1623, and one from Genoa, 27th April, 1657.[2]

Mr. White tells us that about the age of twenty-five he became an infidel; for he spent ten years in the hypocritical support of what he calls imposture, before he left Spain at the age of thirty-five; his conduct did not escape suspicion, for he tells us, his mother avoided his presence lest she should hear what would be against faith; both in his *Evidence* and in *Doblado's Letters* he informs us that profligate clergymen were his companions; but if their conduct was not glaringly bad, it was at least highly suspicious; he gives us abundant proof in his *Doblado's Letters*, volume 2, page 291, of the *Magazine*, that it was, for he is found openly the companion of men under censure.

"I have visited Salamanca after the great defeat of the philosophical party, the strongest that ever was formed in Spain. A man of first rate literary character amongst us, whom merit and court favor had raised to one of the chief seats in the judicature of the country, but whom court caprice had, about this time, sent to rusticate at Salamanca, was doing me the honors of the place, when approaching the convocation hall of the University, we perceived the members of the faculty of divinity strolling about, previous to a meeting of their body. A runaway slave, still bearing the marks of the lash, at his return, could not have shrunk more instinctively at the sight of the planters meeting at the council room, than my friend did at the view of the cowls "white, black, and grey," which partially hid the sleek faces of his offended masters. He had, it is true, been lucky enough to escape his imprisonment and subsequent penance in a monastery, which was the sad lot of the chief of his routed party; but he himself was still suspected and watched closely."

Whether this is the same gentlemen who held an important place in the provincial judicature, and who narrowly escaped the Inquisition; whom he mentions as an infidel companion in page 298, I cannot conjecture. But in that page he informs us that after the acquaintance then formed, he "performed mass with a heart in open rebellion to the Church that enjoined it; but he had now settled with himself, to offer

[2] Vid. Ferrarius, *Biblioth. Jurid.*, etc. Voc. *Moniales.*

it up to his Creator, as he imagines that the enlightened Greeks and Romans did their sacrifices. He was like them, forced to express his thankfulness in an absurd language." The attempt which failed was to introduce into the Spanish Universities the principles of French infidelity, as he himself informs us in page 291. The theses which were introduced he describes as "genuine offspring of the French school, the very turn of their phrases 'in spite of the studied caution of their language,' gave strong indications of a style formed in defiance of the Holy Inquisition." That a man of this description should be selected confessor to a nunnery, is an absurdity so palpable to any divine, that I am only astonished how the man himself had the hardihood to make the assertion. But he knew who his readers were likely to be; persons, who greedily swallow every libel against our Church, and neither know whether its truth is even possible, [nor] perhaps care [whether it is or not.] I am certain I do not judge rashly when I assert that amongst the Right Reverend and reverend approbators of the work there are not three, perhaps not one, who knows that ordinary approbation to hear confessions, does not confer power to hear confessions in nunneries; that approbation to hear them in one nunnery does not include approbation to hear them in another, that approbation to hear the confession of one nun, for instance upon the approach of death, does not include approbation to hear another. And that one of the most unheard of cases, though not absolutely impossible, is that a brother should be the confessor of a nun who is his sister.

But suppose all those obstacles removed, suppose those all to have been dispensed with; one other insuperable difficulty remains. By the common law of the Church no special age is requisite in a priest to be qualified generally to hear confessions. But the congregation before mentioned, decided on the 2d of May, 1617, and on the 7th of June, 1620, in cases from the Patriarchate of Venice, that the confessor of a nunnery ought to be at least over forty years of age. In the Franciscan order, of which the Capuchins are a branch, there is a special statute, (*Sambuc.* cap. 11, ? 17, n. l,) of the minor Observantines, which requires this age, and the force of this statute was decided to extend to the reformed of the order, by a decree of the congregation of the council, the proper tribunal in this case, on the 26th of November, 1689, upon a question from the Archdiocess of Cosenza. When the confessor goes to the discharge of his duty he is accompanied by another clergyman, who remains within view though not within hearing, and by a decision of the congregation of the affairs of Bishops and regulars, on a case from Nola, on the 21st of February, 1617, it is ruled that this com-

panion must be over fifty years of age. And on the 16th of March, 1603, a papal circular order was issued, chiefly to the Bishops of Italy and the adjacent islands, in which the qualifications which are every where required for persons of this description, are enumerated in general terms, *actate provecti, prudentes, zelantes, et vita exemplari conspicui*: "advanced in age, prudent, zealous, and remarkable for their exemplary life."

Let us now review the acknowledged, technical obstacles, if I may so call them, which rendered it impossible; legally and morally impossible, that White could have been a confessor to any nun; except perhaps he might [have been], though in itself [it is] highly improbable, to his eldest sister, at her own request, before her death: but, I believe it will now be admitted that we have no evidence of his ever having had a sister; because, his assertion is no evidence.

First, his conduct was by no means such as to be conspicuous for giving good example; next, he had no appearance of zeal! again, even as a hypocrite, he was imprudent in his company; fourthly, he was a virulent enemy to friars, who of course would not give him their highest appointment; fifthly, a priest who lived as he did, would no more undertake such an office, than he would retire into a desert: again, a man of his principles would infallibly betray himself, by some expression for which he would be denounced to his superior; and a seventh reason, which outweighs the whole, is that he had not attained the necessary age until five years after he had left Spain!!! Now I would request of his compurgators, our Baltimore and Columbia canonists, to look back to the eleven propositions, which this man swears a solemn oath were true. He called God to witness their truth, and that truth is legally and morally impossible!!! And if there is any part of the Church in which that law is most fully in vigor it is in Spain.

Was my expression too strong when I wrote that those men were uninformed in volunteering an exhibition of their own ignorance, from their desire of assailing Popery?

In my next, I shall exhibit some more of Mr. White's veracity, and test the value of his unanswerable argument against Popery.

Yours, B. C.

LETTER VI.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 9, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends—Mr. White has been adduced against us as a witness

of extraordinary qualifications. We have seen that he had not the proper theological knowledge to fit him for being a sufficient judge of doctrine. We have seen that he was immoral in his conduct, deceitful in his youth; an early infidel; a confirmed and steady hypocrite: pretending to have affection in order to excite sympathy; and falsely calling God to witness that he filled places, which it was legally and morally impossible for him to hold; and the solemn secrets of which, if he did hold them, he had sacrilegiously betrayed. I now ask the Right Reverend Dr. Kemp, and his associates, whether this is the witness upon whose testimony they asked the people of America to condemn the great Church of Christendom, and to despise its members? I ask whether the testimony of this man would be taken as of value, in any case of moment, in any court? Whether his simple assertion is evidence?—I shall be told, that Mr. White's character is not the true question.—That the true question is the character of our Church. Yes! But Mr. White is the witness who defames our Church, and the value of the defamation depends upon the competency of the witness; and therefore it was, that I delayed so long in examining his competency, and took up so much of your time in shewing, that as regarded knowledge and honesty, he was an incompetent witness. Therefore whatever is supported only by his testimony is to be disregarded. I shall examine all his charges, separating what rests only upon his testimony from that which has other support, and thus, by this apparently useless examination of his character, we shall find our work greatly abridged. But I cannot consent as yet to close my inquiry into the history of the gentleman himself. To use his own words, I believe it very useful since he is one of a class which presents a moral phenomenon "to proceed with his moral dissection however unpleasant the task may be."

I recommence his *Evidence*, page 20.

"When I examine the state of my mind previous to my rejecting the Christian faith, I cannot recollect any thing in it but what was in perfect accordance with the form of religion in which I was educated. I revered the Scriptures as the word of God; but was also persuaded that without a living, infallible interpreter, the Bible was a dead letter, which could not convey its meaning with any certainty. I grounded therefore my Christian faith upon the infallibility of the Church. No Roman Catholic pretends to a better foundation. 'I believe whatever the holy mother Church holds and believes,' is the compendious creed of every member of the Roman communion. Had my doubts affected any particular doctrine, I should have clung to the decisions of a Church which claims exemption from error; but my first doubts attacked the

very basis of Catholicism. I believe that the reasoning which shook my faith is not new in the vast field of theological controversy. But I protest that if such be the case, the coincidence adds weight to the argument, for I am perfectly certain that it was the spontaneous suggestion of my own mind. I thought within myself that the certainty of the Roman Catholic faith had no better ground than a fallacy of that kind which is called arguing in a circle; I believed the infallibility of the Church, because the Scripture said she was infallible; whilst I had no better proof that the Scripture said so than the assertion of the Church that she could not mistake the Scripture. In vain did I endeavor to evade the force of this argument; indeed I still believe it unanswerable. Was, then, Christianity nothing but a groundless fabric, the world supported by an elephant, the elephant standing on a tortoise? Such was the conclusion to which I was led by a system which impresses the mind with the obscurity and insufficiency of the written word of God. Why should I consult the Scriptures? My only choice was between revelation explained by the Church of Rome and no revelation. Catholics who live in Protestant countries may, in spite of the direct tendency of their system, practically perceive the unreal nature of this dilemma. But wherever the religion of Rome reigns absolutely, there is but one step between it and infidelity."

Before I proceed further, allow me to note the falsehoods of this passage.

No. 1. Previous to his rejecting the Christian faith, he cannot recollect any thing in his mind that was not in perfect accordance with the form of religion in which he had been educated!!!

Should you not recollect his avowals, multiplied and repeated during years, and deliberately written in direct contradiction to this: look back to my second, and third letters.

No. 2. "Had my doubts affected any particular doctrine, I should have clung to the decisions of a Church which claims exemption from error, but my first doubts attacked the very basis of Catholicism."

That this is a falsehood we have abundant evidence. In the first place, in his *Evidence*, page 30, he writes,

"As my rejection of revealed religion had been the effect, not of a direct objection to its evidences, but of weighing tenets against them which they were not intended to support; the balance inclined in favor of the truth of the Gospel, in proportion as I struck out dogmas, which I had been taught to identify with the doctrines of Christ."

In this passage it is plain that he asserts that as soon as the particular doctrines to which he objected, that is concerning whose truth he

had doubts at first, and subsequently unbelief, were stricken out; the old evidences became strong, and he believed by virtue of their force.

Volume 2, of the *Magazine*, page 297, *Doblado's Fifth Letter*, he shews that his first doubts, "against which he wrestled day and night," affected the particular doctrine of hell.

No. 3. The pretended arguing in a circle from the infallibility of the Church to the knowledge of the Scriptures, and from the knowledge of the Scriptures to the infallibility of the Church, was the absurdity the force of which he could not answer, and which of course made him lose his faith.

In page 296, of *Doblado's Letters* he gives as the cause one far more rational, and as different from this as may be conceived. It is substantially this, "The Church is the infallible teacher of the doctrine of truth. I must then believe all that she teaches, or I am an infidel. Let me prove that there exists a single flaw in the system, and it will all crumble to dust. Catholic divines can see no medium between rejecting her infallibility and rejecting revelation, and if she teaches as faith one untrue doctrine, she cannot be infallible." In page 297, he finds what he will not believe, what he looks upon to be an absurdity taught by her as a doctrine of faith, viz. the existence of hell; his words then are, that as this is a part of her doctrine, what can arguments avail a doubting Catholic? "His system of faith in indivisible. Whatever proves it all, proves absurdity." In page 298, he adds "whatever in this state could break the habit of awe, which I was so tenaciously supporting—whatever could urge me into uttering a doubt on one of the articles of the Roman creed, was sure to make my faith vanish like a soap bubble in the air." After conversing with an infidel, "utterance transformed his doubts to demonstrations." What were the subjects? "monks, ecclesiastical encroachments, extravagant devotion." "The very hell I had just denied, appeared yawning before my eyes!" Not one syllable of the vicious circle. No,—his argument was—"If the Church is infallible all her doctrines must be true; but her doctrine of hell cannot be true, because it would argue cruelty in God: to suppose him cruel is an absurdity: therefore she is not infallible." Such, my friends, was the process which he first described. Now he tells us, that it was the argument of the vicious circle: whether you will believe him in either case: or if in either, which is more credible, is for yourselves to determine. Perhaps, however, another passage of his in page 298, *Doblado's Letters*, might aid you to a third cause. He is describing the mode in which he lost his faith; probably the scenes from which his very modest figure is drawn could help you in forming your opinion.

"I had been too earnest in my devotion, and my Church too pressing and demanding. Like a cold and interested mistress, she either exhausts the ardor of her best lovers, or harasses them to distraction. As for myself, a moment's dalliance with her great rival freedom, converted my former love into perfect abhorrence."

I shall not quarrel with his expressions, nor ask how Catholics living any where can perceive that which does not exist. I shall leave the remark which would suggest itself, to a more proper time, and bring the gentleman to a delimma more practical for our present purpose.

No. 4. He says the argument of the vicious circle was, he is perfectly certain, the spontaneous suggestion of his own mind.—

Perhaps so.—But it only adds to the proof against his patrons, because, if true, it will necessarily establish that he never studied a treatise on the nature of the Church; for there is not one such treatise, in which this argument is not adduced against the conclusion: "that the Church is infallible." Well may Bishop Kemp and his associates blush for the "high rank" which they have so generously bestowed upon one who by his total neglect of theological studies was so "eminently qualified for the task which he has undertaken and so well fulfilled." There is not a tyro in theology to whom it is not familiar—and my own impression is that Mr. White was intimately acquainted with it before he lost his faith: not from its having been spontaneously suggested by his mind; but read in his books.—We shall now see its value.

One of the most fallacious modes of exhibiting an argument which is founded upon the observation of facts, is to change the relation which the facts have to each other. Thus, if any effect flows from a particular cause; he must be inclined to deceive, instead of to instruct, who would exhibit both cause and effect as always co-existing, because they do co-exist after the effect has been produced; when in truth there was a time when they did not co-exist, for the cause existed alone, before the effect was produced. An honest, well regulated mind will view them in their natural and historical order, and from the succession of their existence will deduce the reasoning, giving the value of its priority to that which first existed; and never forgetting or concealing, that there was such a relation as priority in one, and dependence, if I may so call it, or consequence in the other. He must indeed be stupid, who because they have co-existed for a long time, forgets that there still is, and always will continue, the distinction of precedence between them to the end of time. And he who knowing the fact of this precedence would labor to conceal it, for the purpose of confounding cause and effect, would be dishonest. This want of intellect or want of honesty must exist in every person who

charges upon the Roman Catholics the fallacy of the vicious circle: or else he must fall into another mistake equally unfortunate.

There is scarcely a moral or religious truth which has not two sorts of arguments in its favor; one which is strong, cogent, and sufficient, and may be called properly and exclusively its proof; the other, not so clear, full or satisfactory, and which rather tends to confirm that which has received previous proof, than to be the motive for its credibility. When both those modes are had recourse to, for maintaining a proposition, it must argue no great share of love for truth in those who know the fact, to speak and to write as if the latter mode only had been used. Yet such is the conduct of those who knowing our doctrine charge upon us the fallacy of the vicious circle.

Again, the connexion between the premises and the conclusion of a sound argument, is so complete and perfect, that although the truth of the former should be apparent, still when by their means the truth of the conclusion becomes evident, though in reality the certainty of their truth is not increased, still the satisfaction of contemplating it is enhanced, and the mind becomes more gratified from the exhibition. This additional pleasure is, by several, mistaken for a new proof of the premises themselves. Thus, though I should know a man to be wise and good and generous, I feel additional pleasure from contemplating the new exhibitions of his wisdom and his goodness and his generosity; my gratification, but not my conviction, is increased. Should I from a Church, which I know to be infallible, receive books, of whose inspiration I could have no knowledge, but for her testimony; should I find in those books themselves, additional exhibitions of what I already knew, viz. her infallibility; my former knowledge is not derived from this late discovery, though I feel my pleasure thereby augmented. And although I cannot fairly use this late and gratifying discovery to prove my original premises, it will not be the error of a vicious circle to apply it as a confirmation of that for which I had already convincing evidence.

It not unfrequently happens regarding the proof and value of written documents, that their authenticity can be proved only by the authority of a tribunal; the authority of which tribunal was evident without the documents, and before they existed; but when by the authority of the tribunal their value was established, the documents themselves were found to contain new proof of the authority of the tribunal. Yet to use this new proof in addition to that which was old and sufficient, and which existed before the documents were written, would not be arguing in a circle; because though admitting their value, their testimony would prove the power of the tribunal: still it was not by them it was originally

proved. Thus if a stranger has the public testimony that the persons who preside in one of our courts are the supreme judges of the state, this testimony is evidence for him of their authority.

Having this knowledge of their power, he observes their proceedings; he beholds them not only declare that certain books have legal authority, but he finds that they interpret certain passages of those books, as being good testimony in favor of their exercise of power; they never refer to the commission by virtue of which they sit, but they refer to the book, which their decision explains. Surely, no person would say that this court was guilty of a vicious circle, by claiming their power of decision from the book, and by their decision making the book to be authority. For it is obvious that their power of decision existed and was generally known, without the book: and the general tenor of the book might be known before their decision, and might be valuable before the decision; yet it was by the decision of what was the exact import of the passages, the application became precisely fixed.

It now rests with me to show that it is not from the Scriptures that Roman Catholics learn the infallibility of their Church, though it is from that Church they do learn the inspiration of the Scriptures. And, indeed, my friends, after deep and serious investigation, I hesitate not to avow, with one whom I should not name in the same line with myself, the great St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, "I would not believe the Gospel, were I not induced thereto by the authority of the Church."[3]

In order to view the case fairly, and without prejudice, we must go to its origin, in the mode of creating the ecclesiastical tribunal, and of getting from that tribunal the testimony of the inspiration of the Scriptures. We must then take the facts in their historical order. We, in such a case, have no Scriptures of either old or new law recognized as being inspired, and we go back to Judea at the time previous to the death of our Saviour. I know from history what I now assert. I know the facts, also, from documents and monuments of the highest character. The observant person would, at that time, have witnessed a vast number of miracles performed by the Saviour; from the evidence of the miracles, the truth of his doctrine, and his power to grant a commission, and to state what the extent of that commission should be, must result. He does teach doctrine, and gives his commission to some of his followers. He is put to death; he arises; this resurrection is proclaimed: miracles prove its truth. He sends the Holy Ghost upon those whom he commissions, they prove and confirm this fact by miracles. Their

[3] *Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicae Ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas. Lib. contra Ep. Manich,* chap. v, 6. Migne, vol. viii, col. 17.

commission is now evidently established, and they may be easily known. The commission is extended, and is to be still more extended and perpetuated, and the miraculous confirmation accompanies its extension and its continuance. No fact was ever more evident to any community, than was the commission of the early teachers to those who beheld them. That they were commissioned, amongst other things, to teach the doctrine of Christ to all men, and to provide for its continuance to the end of the world, and for its extension to every place, became also matter of evident notoriety. It was equally evident to the persons who lived with them, that one of the principal objects of Christ was, to preserve for all times that truth which he came from heaven to preach; and that the mode in which he provided for its preservation, was by establishing a tribunal from which it was to be learned; and that they who learned the doctrine, obtained their knowledge, not by philosophical disquisition, not by perusing documents which as yet had not been written, not by taking the opinions of what men though reasonable, or liberal, or becoming, or convenient, but simply by receiving from the commissioned body of teachers, the testimony of what was originally taught—and by resting upon their authority for its truth. It is plain, they could have had no other way of learning what Christ had taught. Did any one of those teachers differ from another in his testimony, the general body was consulted. History leaves not a shadow of doubt as to the fact; and reason exhibits the correctness of the mode; and the evidence derived from the general testimony of the body, led to the correction of the mistake of the individual. Those first Christians also knew, that the solemn injunction which had been given by Christ was, to receive unhesitatingly the testimony of the body of the Apostles and their associates; and that, in doing so, the people received the testimony of Christ himself. The miracles wrought by those persons confirmed the belief of those principles, and they themselves inculcated it as derived from Christ. It is a plain fact of history, that, when the members of this tribunal gave a doctrinal decision, they gave it in full accordance with this principle: for they declared that the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of truth, who descended upon the first teachers, and was communicated by them to their associates, joined in their assembly, presided over their meeting, and spoke in their decision. It is matter of historical evidence, that all those who refused to receive and to submit to such decision, were considered as opposed to revealed truth, and disobedient to the command of the Saviour, because they did not hear those whom he sent as their teachers, Thus, before the Scriptures were known to the Christians, they knew the Church; and they recognized its infallible authority in teaching the doc-

trine which had been revealed, and of which it was made the witness and the depository. Thus, it was not by the Scriptures the first Christians proved the infallibility of the Church; but they proved it before the Scriptures existed, by the plain fact, that he who had proved his authority by miracles, had used authority in giving the power of teaching his doctrine, with infallible certainty of correctness, to this tribunal, which he created for that purpose. It is admitted by all persons, that the teaching of truth was one of the principal objects of commissioning the Apostles and their successors. It would be indeed beneath the wisdom and power of the Godhead to send teachers, evidently commissioned by heaven, to whom men respecting that commission ought to listen; and still, that this body commissioned by heaven were equally liable as any other body to teach error instead of truth!!! Of what value, then, would be their divine commission? If they led men to error, how were men to find those who would bring them back to truth? Even Mr. White himself admits the soundness of this Catholic principle. *Doblado's Letters*, page 296, volume ii, number five:

"I have often heard the question, how could such men as Bossuet and Fenelon adhere to the Church of Rome, and reject the Protestant faith? The answer appears to be obvious. Because, according to their undoubted principles on this matter, they must have been either Catholics or infidels. Laying it down that Christianity was chiefly intended to reveal a system of doctrine necessary for salvation, they *naturally* and *consistently* inferred the existence of an authorized judge upon questions of faith; otherwise the inevitable doubts arising from private judgment would defeat the object of revelation. Thus it is that Bossuet thought he had triumphantly confuted the Protestants, by merely showing that they could not agree in their articles. Like Bossuet, most Catholic divines (Mr. White might have written all) can see no medium between denying the infallible authority of the Church and rejecting revelation.

"No proposition in Euclid could convey a stronger conviction to my mind than I found in this dilemma. Let me but prove, said I to myself, that there exists a single flaw in the system, and it will all crumble into dust," and so forth.

Thus, if Mr. White believed that a principal object of our Saviour was to reveal to the world a system of doctrine, the belief of which would be necessary for salvation, *naturally* and *consistently*, he must infer from this, the infallibility of the Church. From Mr. White's denial of this infallibility, we must naturally and consistently infer, that Mr. White does not believe a principal object of the Saviour was to make a belief

of his doctrines necessary for salvation. What says Bishop Kemp now to Mr. White's principles of faith? If it be a matter of indifference, so far as regards salvation, what system of doctrine man is to believe, why did those good gentlemen separate from the Catholic Church? Why not come back to us now? Why use such pains to correct our "errors of Popery?" Why collect so much money to convert Heathens? Why keep separate Churches from each other? Why will not the Bishop, and the Presbyterian, and the Methodist, meet together, and proclaim to their people that it matters not, so far as concerns salvation, to which flock they are attached? Why not proclaim to them that they might as well be Roman Catholics? I promise you, my friends, Mr. White will turn the tables upon those who brought him forward to annoy us.

Then, it is plain, that the first Christians believed that a principal object of their divine teacher was to reveal a system of doctrine, which was so necessary to salvation, that he commanded them to lay down their lives sooner than desert it; and all its teachers gave them, not only such injunctions, but confirmed the injunctions by their example. They shed their blood sooner than deny one article of faith! Mr. White might have left his Indian story of the world resting upon the elephant, and the elephant upon the tortoise, for some more appropriate subject; because, in the first place, it is no exemplification of a vicious circle, and next, the first Christians believed naturally and consistently from the nature of their doctrine, as Mr. White shows, that the Church was infallible; and I have shown that history will prove it to have been necessarily one of the first principles which they received, years before any of the evangelists began to write his gospel. And when the Church was deluged with several foolish, spurious, ridiculous, and blasphemous productions, purporting to be inspired Scriptures, the distinction between what was really inspired, and what was not, could never have been drawn with certainty, unless by a tribunal whose decisions must be infallibly correct: because, if it were possible for the tribunal which made the selection of what was inspired, from the mass, to err, we may without absurdity or irreligion suppose that it really did err, in giving to us this one book. Without an infallible guide, how shall we now know how to discern this from amongst the others? What then becomes of the certainty of faith? How shall we now know the books of God from the production of a fanatic? A Roman Catholic knows, without the Scripture, that the Church must be and is infallible, in giving to him the doctrines which God revealed, and amongst these, the mighty portion of that doctrine which the sacred volume contains. His knowledge of

the infallibility of his Church, and of the inspiration of the sacred volume now co-exist, and have for ages co-existed; he has by traditionary documents, by authentic records, by standing monuments, by a thousand proofs which his Church has always preserved and exhibited, obtained the knowledge of both together; but, formerly, at its proper time, one did precede the other; the Church existed before the New Testament, as the Jewish Church existed before the Old Testament. We received them all together: the Christian Church brought the Old Testament from the Jewish Church; she testified the New when it appeared; she kept both from corruption; and at this day, I stand as much in need of her testimony, to assure me that the book which I receive is unchanged, as my predecessors did, to know that the book given to them was inspired. Deprive me of the testimony of the Church, and how shall I discern if the book which I read is the production of an inspired writer, or of a fanatic? Though I should know that the evangelists were inspired, how shall I know that what I read is their production? Deprive me of the witness given to the world before the book existed, and which testified the nature of the book to my predecessors, and which was commissioned as the witness of all ages, and I shall be now, as they would have been, without the testimony. This is no vicious circle, nor will it become one, though the book thus proved should contain testimonies in confirmation and in support of what was believed upon sufficient proof before the book itself was proved or even written.

You must also, my friends, observe what an egregious contradiction there is, between the several accounts which this unfortunate man gives of the process which led to his infidelity. I have frequently examined those who fabricated; but such a constant and yet varying adherence to falsehood, I do not think ever struck me in any other as in Mr. White.

As Bishop Kemp has kindly undertaken the patronage of this charge of the vicious circle, I think he ought now, in common justice, to give to the world his mode of ascertaining, how any portion of the Scripture is the result of inspiration. I will point out but one chapter, and if he will prove its inspiration, or even its authenticity, without having recourse to the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church, I shall give him more credit than I am at present inclined to bestow. Let him signify his intention, and I shall point out the chapter, in the Bible which he receives; and I am much mistaken if I shall not in that event be able to afford to my fellow-citizens, a good specimen of the world, the elephant and the tortoise, exemplified.

My friends, I shall continue my examination.

Yours, B. C.

LETTER VII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 16, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends—We have seen Mr. White's account of his loss of the Catholic faith. He next presents us with a history of his conversion to the Protestantism of the Church of England. When he arrived in that country in the year 1810, he was thirty-five years of age.

He informs us that he expected to find no piety or religion in England, and pays the English people a compliment by stating that as they were enlightened, and as the French philosophers led him to believe, that in the ratio of his information, man was irreligious, therefore England must be very irreligious. But providentially, he in London met a good and pious friend, and he afterwards found many excellent men of the same description. He found the protection of British liberty and was ashamed of being thought a Roman Catholic. By the bye, if he [had been] a Roman Catholic, he would in England have felt the benefit of penal infliction, and he was very wise as he had no religion, not to subject himself to persecution, by continuing to be a hypocrite. The soreness arising from the endurance of his ten years' subjection to scrutiny began to heal. Professing himself an infidel, he was received with mildness and toleration. There is nothing strange in this. The law of England does not punish a man for being an infidel; it punishes him seriously, only for being a Catholic. Thus it is not against the conscience of an atheist to swear that he does not believe in transubstantiation, it is not against the conscience of a pagan to swear that no foreign prelate hath or ought to have any ecclesiastical or spiritual authority within the realm of England. It does not injure the conscience of any person but of a Catholic to swear all or any of their oaths. White might indeed say they were mild and tolerant to him, infidel as he was, but neither Sir Thomas More, nor the present Duke of Norfolk could say the same of themselves. But of course Mr. White calls cherishing himself, toleration, and he calls the political incarceration of the noble duke, because he will not become a member of some one of the new religions, or an infidel, toleration!—Mr. White found then for the first time he says "that a Christian is not necessarily a bigot." I have yet to learn that this writer knows either what a Christian or a bigot is. I shall give my own statement of what they are. A Christian is a person who steadily and upon principle believes all the doctrines which Christ has taught and adheres to the institutions of Christ. However vague the meaning which is usually given to the phrase may be, its true meaning is precise and definite: that man

who has not a fixed principle of belief, who doubts to-day, what he believed yesterday, and who knows not, and cares not to know, what God has taught and established in the Christian law, is not a Christian, in the proper meaning of the word. What would be thought of me, were I to assert that a man was a good American citizen, who neither knew nor cared for what were the principles of our constitution or our rules of law, and would as soon take them from the explanation of an inhabitant of Hayti as from the decision of the Supreme Court? Revealed religion consists in that collection of doctrine and law which God has made known: the Christian religion is that body of doctrine and that code of law which Christ has given. What Christ gave was not contradiction; but coherent truth, consistent in all its parts; and it is unchangeable, for if it be changed it ceases to be what it was before the alteration; it ceases then to be the institution of Christ, it becomes something different from Christianity. A Christian firmly adheres to what Christ has taught and established, he avoids changes; he cannot call error truth, nor change the old institutions. Thus a Christian firmly and reasonably adheres to truth; and refuses to call recent changes the original institution. Bigotry is unreasonable and obstinate adherence to a religious opinion, combined with a hatred of those who are opposed thereto. The Christian does not adhere to opinion, for it is not upon his own opinion he rests, but he receives the testimony of that Church to which Christ originally gave his doctrine, that what she now teaches is what she originally received: he believes the doctrine upon her testimony, not upon his own private opinion. That she is an infallibly correct and competent witness, we shall afterwards see: thus his adherence to doctrine is not unreasonable, for it is holding to public known truth, not to private opinion, and his steady adherence to it is not obstinate attachment. He has no hatred against those who err, he is full of charity and of affection for them, and if he informs them of their error, it is not for the purpose of wounding their feelings but of enlightening their minds, and inducing them to serve God, that they may be happy. The bigot is known by his rancor, by his obstinacy, by his personal vindictive disposition, by his vague rhapsody; the Christian is known by his steady calm adherence to doctrine, by his plain declaration, by his firm expostulation, by his precise, definite enunciation of what he knows to be true. If Mr. White had written truly, he would not have asserted that he had to journey from Seville to London, and to wait during upwards of thirty years until he met with a pious Protestant, to find "that a Christian is not necessarily a bigot." My friends, I have the happiness to rank amongst my acquaintance some of the most intelligent and enlightened Protestants in both hem-

ispheres. I have been in close intimacy with Catholics of almost every grade. I assert as the result of my close and continued observation, that if Mr. White's assertion is meant to convey the idea, that there is amongst Catholics less true charity, less kind feeling, less of correct liberality for those separated from their communion, than there exists amongst any division of Protestants for Catholics: a more untenable and baseless position was never taken. Before I close this series, we shall have full opportunity to prove it. At present, I shall advert but to one fact. Has any body of the Catholic clergy of the United States ever been guilty of solemnly recommending to their flocks the libels of any Protestant clergyman, who joined the church, as the best mode of learning the tenets and character of the Protestant people? Has any one of the respectable clergymen, who have joined our Church, made an atrocious attack upon those whose communion he had left? Yet we have many such amongst us. This at least is a sort of bigotry which does not belong to our Christianity. No one of our Bishops has made hinself as notoriously conspicious as Bishop Kemp. When we assail their system, it is not by such a work as no modest woman should read, such a work as no man of fine feelings of gentlemanly principle could recommend, if he had read it, as I hope and trust the Right Reverend and Reverend approbators did not.

But to return: White, having met this mild and tolerant Christian, began to perceive that he might again become a believer, provided he saw religion divested of all force but that of persuasion. Will you believe it? He would tell us that this was the case in England! ! ! In England, whose disgraceful code of persecution, according to Edmund Burke,[4] was more barbarously afflictive than was that of Nero or of Dioclesian! In England, which by her persecution on the score of religion, has thrice depopulated Ireland! In England, whose bloody scourge has lacerated more Christian flesh than did all the Pagan persecutors. In England, whose myrmidons long desolated Scotland, and followed her hardy sons into their most remote fastnesses, to massacre them for their dissent from her liturgy, and their dislike of her surplice! In England, whose bench of Bishops still rivets the chains of millions who refuse to desert the religion of their fathers, and those, the men who bled at Salamanaca, at Orthes, at Vimiera, at Talavera, upon the Pyrennes, before Toulouse, at Waterloo; and whom her spirit of aggression led to the slaughter-pen of New Orleans! In England, which by the blasphemous oath of the craven of Dunkirk and of the Helder, keeps shorn of the

[4] Vid. *Tracts relative to the Laws against Popery in Ireland,* passim.

mighty meed of their large honors, the descendants of the peers, who with the Catholic princes of Catholic England swept the fields of Cressy, of Poiotiers, and of Agincourt; the descendants of the men who claimed at Runnymede the restitution of their rights, at a period when he who basely gave to his profligate concubine the patronage of the English army, and of a portion of its Church, would be at a loss to discover the stem or root of his German ancestry. Yes, in that England, within the walls of whose Parliament the ungrateful Duke of Wellington, but the other day declared, that it was by the sword the Protestant religion was planted in Ireland, and that by the sword alone it should be maintained; and to keep it in which wretched country, an army of every species of oppressive hirelings is employed! Yet,—In that England, this man tells us that he saw religion divested of all force but persuasion! How is it that even by accident he will not write some truth?

He next read Paley's *Natural Theology*, and was struck by the author's peculiar manner and style: he was much interested. Did Mr. White study his treatise *Of God*, in metaphysics; *On Religion*, in ethics; *On Natural Religion*, in theology; every one of which was in his course of studies at Seville, he would have found nothing new in Paley, except his English and his false assertions. But the gentleman quarreled with his professor of philosophy and could not attend to the "dull divinity" lectures. Perhaps the arguments he found were, to him, new. But who will believe him when he says that he now felt pious toward the great author of nature? Natural Theology establishes no revelation. White tells us that he only from being a Catholic, became a hypocrite—an infidel of the French school, I presume, not an atheist; though really it is impossible to say what the grade of French infidelity is. I have met it of every size and shade and appearance, and after much reflection have concluded, that neither can the infidel himself or any other person tell what he believes; but like the man who began to take a catalogue of the goods which he had not; there is no knowing where or when you would be likely to conclude, if you began to write down what he did not believe: I have known one of them go so far as to assure me that he did not believe in his own existence, because he would cease to be a Pyrrhonist if he could be certain of his existence; yet I know not how he escaped the difficulty, by the absurdity; for he was certain, that he did not exist. Unless Mr. White went as far as this good humored, facetious and accommodating nonenity of a gentleman, he must have been certain of his own existence, and of that of the universe; and he need not then be in doubt of the existence of God, until he struck his foot against a watch, or read the Archdeacon's book.

In this state of mind he went into a Protestant Church, and was greatly affected by the solemnity, and the music and hymn. For years before he had not entered a Church without feelings of hostility, though he was to officiate, and of irritation, though he was to get money for submitting to what he calls tyranny. Yet in this very passage, Mr. White tells us that he did not believe what was contained in the prayers, and still "there was nothing that could check sympathy or smother the reviving sentiments of natural religion which Paley had awakened." For my part, I can have no sympathy with a person who prays for what I do not believe to be correct,—Mr. White's doctrine of sympathy is not intelligible to me. If his sentiments of natural religion were only awakened by Paley, how could he in the day of his infidelity have offered his sacrifices as Plato and Socrates did, who had natural religion? Thus we must believe that he possessed, and did not possess natural religion, at the same time; whilst he was a Deist he was an Atheist. I suspect after all the Pyrrhonism of my French friend will answer equally well for my regenerated Spaniard. Now the solemn and affecting prayers which pleased him so much are nothing more or less than translations from those which he tells us in another place disgusted him; but perhaps they sounded better in English than in Latin.—No question about tastes. —The Protestant Episcopal Church has very wisely contented itself with our good old Popish prayers, most of which have seventeen centuries of age, and several almost eighteen centuries. Mr. White was by the law of his Church bound, and is still, if he lives, bound to recite daily those prayers and psalms in Latin, but this was troublesome. *Doblado's Letters* Number 5, page 297.

"An unmeaning and extremely burthensome practice laid by the Church of Rome upon her clergy, contributed not a little to increase the irksomeness of my circumstances. A Catholic Clergyman, who employs his whole day in the discharge of his duty to others, must yet repeat to himself the service of the day in an audible voice—a performance which neither constant practice, nor the most rapid utterance, can bring within the compas, of less than a hour and a half in the four and twenty. This exhausting exercise is enjoined under pain of mortal sin, and the restitution of that day's income on which any portion of the office is omitted."

What a difference the same prayer may exhibit to him in an English dress, I know not. But Mr. White ought to know that in the present Church of England the clergy were originally bound in the same way to the Common Prayer which is but an abridged translation of the *Breviary*, but like Mr. White they thought it unmeaning and extremely burthensome to spend so much time in prayer, and a contrary custom has made

the law fall into disuse. Being now impressed, he never passed a day "without some ardent aspirations toward the author of his life and existence." But lest this should not have a sufficiency of effect, we of course are not left without "eyes streaming with tears." Yet the conversion was not complete.

I shall here give the passage by which the English Protestant clergy were bound to read the Office daily, to shew Mr. White's friends that originally the Church which that gentleman joined required, if not an hour and a half, at least upwards of half an hour in the twenty-four to be spent in reciting prayers. In the first preface to the *Liturgy of Queen Elizabeth* was the following passage:

"And all the priests and deacons are bound to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer, either privately or openly, except they be let by preaching, studying divinity, or some other urgent cause."

To which the *Scotch Liturgy* added:

"Of which cause, if it be frequently pretended, they are to make the Bishop of the diocess, or the Archbishop of the province, the judge and allower."

To show that this was not public reading in the Church, the next sentence provides specially for that object:

"And the curate that minstereth in every parish church or chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably letted, shall say the same in the parish church or chapel where he ministereth, and shall toll a bell thereto, a convenient time before he begin, that such as may be disposed may come and hear God's word and pray with him."

But what altogether removes any doubt upon the subject, is the testimony of Hammond L'Estrange upon the subject; in his *Alliance of the Divine Offices*, printed in London in 1699, third folio edition, page 27, letter S.; commenting upon the above passage, he has the following:

"The act preceding (respecting the liturgy, 5 and 6 Edward VI), telling us so expressly that open prayer is such as is made in a cathedral, church, chapel, or oratory, in a consecrated place, we need no Œdipus to unriddle the import of private, or to doubt that it signifieth any thing other that such as is performed at home. But, why is the minister bound to say it daily either in publick or at home? Some think our Church had under consideration how ignorant and illiterate many vicars were, and ordered thus, that they might *con* in private, the better to enable them for the publick. But I am of another perswasion: for first, the Church I conceive would not as she doth enjoin them to officiate in publick, did she not suppose them already in some tollerable degree fitted for the servise. Again, the words are general, not definitely such and such of those

mean abilities, but all ministers without exception. Now, though very many were, yet it is no cheritable judgment to believe them all dunces; and it is apparent, that where such ignorance fell under the consideration of authority, the phrase doth vary, with a particular application to them alone who were guilty of it; so it is in the Queen's injunctions (*Eliz. Injunct.* 35) such; (such only, not all) as are, but mean readers, shall peruse over before, once or twice the Chapters and other Homilies, to the intent, that they may read to the better understanding of the people, and the more encouragement of godliness. So that I rather think the Churche's policy was the better to inure and habituate clergy to religious duties," and so forth.

From this, it is plain, that originally the Church of England, which only omitted some portions of our breviary, and translated the retained part into English, enjoined its daily recital to her clergy, as a good and sanctifying religious practice. I believe, like Mr. White, they considered it to be an unmeaning and extremely burthensome practise, and have long since permitted this and many similar regulations to fall into disuse. My object is to show that the prayers were no novelty to the gentleman, if he had been in the habit of reading his breviary; but I ought to have recollected what he had written in *Doblado's Letters*, page 299: "The breviary, in its black binding, clasps, and gilt leaves, is kept upon the table to check the doubts of any chance intruder;" and in all probability this was the only use which had been made of it during several years; so that, perhaps, the prayers were new to the gentleman, and what he could have known in the Catholic Church was forgotten.

I shall conclude this letter, by giving you a tolerable large extract from Mr. White's *Evidence*, so as in his own words to lay before you the whole process of his conversion from infidelity to the English Protestant Church:

"This was all the change that for a year or more took place, in my religious notions. Obliged to support myself chiefly by my pen, and anxious at the same time to acquire some branches of learning, which Spanish education neglects, my days and nights were employed in study; yet religion had daily some share of my attention. I learned that the author of the *Natural Theology* had also written a work on the *Evidences of Christianity*, and curiosity led me to read it. His argument appeared to me very strong; but I found an intrinsic incredibility in the facts of revealed history, which no general evidence seemed able to remove. I was indeed laboring under what I believe to be a very common error in this matter—an error which I have not been able completely to correct, without a very long study of the subject myself. I expected that general

evidence would remove the natural inverisimilitude of miraculous events; that, being convinced by unanswerable arguments that Christ and his Apostles could be neither impostors nor enthusiasts, and that the narrative of their ministry is genuine and true, the imagination would not shrink from forms of things so dissimilar to its own representations of real objects, and so conformable in appearance with the tricks of jugglers and impostors. Now, the fact is, that probable and likely, though used as synonymous in common language, are perfectly distinct in philosophy. The probable is that for the reality of which we can allege some reason: the likely, that which bears in its face a semblance or analogy to what is classed in our minds under the predicament of existence. This association is made early in life among Christians, in favor of the miraculous events recorded in the Holy Scriptures; and if not broken by infidelity in after-life, the study of the Gospel evidence gives those events a character of reality, which leaves the mind satisfied and at rest; because it finds the history of revealed religion not only probable but likely. It is much otherwise with a man who rejects the Gospel for a considerable period, and accustoms his mind to rank the supernatural works recorded by revelation, with falsehood and imposture. Liklihood, in this case, becomes the strongest ground of belief; and probability, though it may convince the understanding, has but little influence over the imagination.

"A sceptic who yields to the powerful proofs of revelation, will, for a long time, experience a most painful discordance between his judgment and the associations which unbelief has produced. When most earnest in the contemplation of Christian truth, when endeavoring to bring home its comforts to the heart, the imagination will suddenly revolt, and cast the whole, at a sweep, among the rejected notions. This is, indeed, a natural consequence of infidelity, which mere reasoning is not able to remove. Nothing but humble prayer can, indeed, obtain that faith which, when reason and sound judbment have led us to supernatural truth, gives to unseen things the body and substance of reality. But of this I shall have occasion to speak again.

"The degree of conviction produced by Paley's Evidences was, however, sufficiently powerful to make me pray daily for divine assistance. This was done in a very simple manner. Every morning I repeated the Lord's prayer seriously and attentively, offering up to my Maker a sincere desire of the knowledge of him. This practice I continued three years. My persuasion, that Christianity was not one and the same thing with the Roman Catholic religion, growing stronger all the while. As my rejection of revealed religion had been the effect, not of direct

objection to its evidences, but of weighing tenets against them, which they were not intended to support; the balance inclined in favor of the truth of the Gospel, in proportion as I struck out dogmas, which I had been taught to identify with the doctrines of Christ. The day arrived, at length, when, convinced of the substantial truth of Christianity, no question remained before me, but that of choosing the form under which I was to profess it. The deliberation which preceded this choice, was one of no great difficulty to me. The points of difference between the Churches of England and Rome, though important, are comparatively few; they were, besides, the very points which had produced my unbelief. That the doctrines common to both Churches were found in the Scriptures, my early studies and professional knowledge left me no room to doubt; and, as the evidence of revelation had brought me to acknowledge the authority of the Scriptures, I could find no objection to the resumption of tenets which had so long possessed my belief. The communion in which I was inclined to procure admission was not, indeed, that in which I was educated; but I had so long wandered away from the Roman fold, that, when approaching the Church of England, both the absence of what had driven me from Catholicism, and the existence of all the other parts of that system made me feel as if I were returning to the repaired home of my youth.

"Upon receiving the sacrament for the first time, according to the form of the English Church, my early feelings of devotion revived; yet by no means, as it might be feared in a common case, with some secret leaning to what I had left; for Catholicism was thoroughly blended with my bitterest recollections. It was a devotion more calm and more rational; if not quite strong in faith, yet decided as to practice. The religious act I performed, I considered as a most solemn engagement to obey the laws of the Gospel; and I thank God that, since that period, whatever clouds have obscured my religious views, no deliberate breach of the sacred law, has increased the sting of remorse, which the unbelieving part of my life left in my breast.

"The renovated influence of religion, cherished by meditation and study, induced me, after a period of a year and a half, to resume my priestly character; a step without which I thought I had not completed the re-acknowledgment I owed to the truth of Christianity. If any one, unacquainted with my circumstances, should be inclined to suspect my motives, he may easily ascertain his mistake, by inquiring into the uniform tenor of my conduct since, in 1814, I subscribed the articles of the Church of England."

I must reserve my comments upon this passage to my next letter, and remain

Yours, respectfully,

B. C.

LETTER VIII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 23. 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends—I now come to consider the process by which Mr. White asserts he became a member of the Church of England. He attributes his conversion, in the first place, to the study of Paley's *Evidences of Christianity*. But he informs us, that no reasoning can remove infidelity, page 29, that "nothing but a humble prayer can obtain that faith which when reason and sound judgment have led us to supernatural truth gives to things unseen the body and substance of reality." Concerning this, to use his own phrase, we shall have more hereafter.

Archdeacon Paley sets out with a plain proposition: That it is only by miracles a revelation can be made. "Preparatory Considerations," paragraph 3. "Now in what way can a revelation be made by miracles? In none which we are able to conceive." If Mr. White was then converted to Christianity by Archdeacon Paley's *Evidences*, he must have been convinced of the truth of the miracles by which the divine mission of the Apostles was attested; and indeed, the Archdeacon has put the proof strongly. But if Mr. White had been in the least degree conversant with the history or theology of his former Church, which is ours, he must have plainly seen that in the two chapters of the archdeacon's proofs of his second proposition part I, he was guilty of a great number of palpably false statements; and it was only by supposing the truth of those statements, he was able to prevent the full force of his *Evidences* in support of Christianity, from becoming proofs of the exclusive truth of Catholicism. Here Mr. White must have been either very ignorant of what he ought to know; or it is perfectly impossible that he could, through Doctor Paley's *Evidences*, have become a Christian without becoming a Roman Catholic. I do not think his ignorance is so great as this would require, and therefore I am of the opinion that to this moment Mr. White is not a believer in the truth of the Christian religion.

Doctor Paley having in his first proposition established the fact, that miracles were wrought to attest the commission of the teachers of Christianity, and having in his preparatory considerations, admitted the principle, that it is only by miracles we can obtain a revelation: it fol-

lowed as a matter of course, that the first teachers were commissioned to tell mankind what those revealed doctrines were. It also inevitably followed that wherever a miracle was proved to exist, the consequence would be the same. Thus the great difficulty which Paley had to encounter presented itself in the fact that the doctrines of Popery as he was pleased to call them, were supported by the very same evidence by which he established the truth of Christianity. And until he could get rid of this difficulty, Popery and Christianity must stand or fall together. From the earliest days of the Church, and through every age, Roman Catholics have constantly adduced this proof. We shall exhibit in our Church, miracles; the author of our religion has declared that miracles would continue amongst the believers in his revelation, therefore either the whole system of Christianity is a delusion; or we are the true believers.

The archdeacon takes the most compendious mode of evading the difficulty; for he never alludes to the declaration, and he boldly denies truth of the fact. Now if Mr. White had paid the least attention to his theological studies, he must have seen that the facts which archdeacon Paley denied were in several instances true, and that those whose truth might be denied had no influence or bearing on the question at issue. I shall exhibit to you those parts of Paley's dissertation to which I allude.

Part I, prop. ii, section 1: he states that he may omit as unworthy of examination so far as regards proof of doctrine "such accounts of supernatural events as are found only in histories by some ages posterior to the transaction, and of which it is evident the historian could know little more than his reader." With this principle I fully concur. Amongst the exemplifications, he classes "a great part of the legendary history of Popish saints, the very best attested of which is extracted from the certificates that are exhibited during the process of their canonization, a ceremony which seldom takes place till a century after their deaths." This is properly divisible into two parts, 1st, his general proposition: "a great part of the legendary history of Popish saints," has been written long after they died: and 2d, "the best attested miracles of those saints are extracted from certificates exhibited at their canonization, which seldom takes place till after the lapse of a century." Suppose I were to grant the truth of his first proposition its extent is only to a great part but not to the whole of his legendary history. Now if even any part of the history of miracles is true, it is true that miracles have been wrought in the Popish Church, and therefore Popery stands upon the same grounds as far as regards miracles, as does Christianity itself. The arch-

deacon's argument will be perfectly valueless if he admits even one substantial miracle for Popery; because, if one miracle can be wrought in support of error, a miracle ceases to be an infallible test of truth; if a miracle be not an infallible evidence of truth, we have no certainty of the Christian doctrine being a divine revelation: the archdeacon dared not to assert openly that no one of the miracles wrought in the Popish Church was evident: but he used that stratagem, which must be the refuge of a bad cause; by equivocal and vague propositions, he endeavored to approximate insensibly to his menacing position.

His next assertion is an exhibition of disingenuity. He does not state an open falsehood, but he artfully constructs his sentence, so as to convey to the reader an untruth which he does not plainly write. A cursory view of his sentence would lead his reader to believe that the first time the certificate of the truth of miracles was submitted to public and solemn investigation, was not until a century after the alleged occurrence: that such an assertion was necessary to render his argument of any avail is plain, when we look to the principle, which asserts that proof to be insufficient which is only adduced ages posterior to the transaction. Now the archdeacon knew, and if Mr. White did not know he ought to have known, that the substantiated and sworn and sifted history was contained in the certificate drawn up at the time of the occurrence, although it was only produced at the process which preceded the canonization. If the certificate was the official attestation of the result of a public and strict inquiry, at the time and on the spot, where the transaction occurred, it became a history, whose true date was the period of its formation, not that of its production. As well might Doctor Paley be told "Sir, you ask me to believe the truth of a miraculous occurrence which you say took place eighteen centuries ago, you produce a book which contains the account: why did you not ask me to examine it in Judea at the time of its occurrence?" The doctor would answer, that the transactions testified were examined by competent witnesses at the time, and place, and that these books were the certificates which contained the result of the examination. Such is my answer to the doctor. By your looking to his phraseology, you will find he does not state that the certificate was framed during the process of canonization, but was exhibited at that time. Now the doctor's principle cannot bear upon the fact, if the certificate was "cotemporary history," for he distinguishes the proofs "which are found only in history by some ages posterior to the transaction," and which he deems insufficient, with what he calls sufficient, and what supported Christianity: this he describes [in the sentence] "ours is cotemporary history." If then the certificates which are exhibited be co-

temporary history, Doctor Paley's reasoning is bad, and he is disingenuous. But the certificates are "cotemporary history," as I have shewn.

A plain principle of common sense and of common law is, that no person can testify any thing but what he has observed: a hearsay witness can only testify that an assertion has been made, but as several false assertions are made, our knowledge of the assertion is not knowledge of its truth. Thus a certificate of hear-say is no evidence: nor is a certificate of a fact evidence of the fact, unless in the same manner that history would be evidence thereof. It will be necessary to digress a little, by way of historical inquiry, in order to shew the value of Dr. Paley's assertion.

Roman Catholics believe that it is now equally in the power of God to work a miracle as it was at any former period, and if there exists evidence of a miracle having been performed at any time, it ought to be believed: the archdeacon himself will not object to this principle. Roman Catholics have regulated that the proper judges officially to examine and to decide upon the truth of the fact, and of its nature, are the Bishops, and those men of prudence and piety and science whom they may call upon. When miracles were said to have occurred, the Bishops, so aided, examined upon the spot, publicly, and proclaimed their judgment. The proofs required for the pious belief of any person's being a saint after death, were extraordinary sanctity of life, and repeated miracles performed, especially by occasion of the person, at or about or even after death. The Bishops after diligent inquiry upon the spot, at the time, frequently found those proofs, and publicly proclaimed their belief and judgment. It was complained of, that sometimes this examination was not as rigorous as it ought to have been, and precautions were taken to guard against partiality and precipitancy. By an ordinance of the Council of Trent, passed in the 25th session, on the 3d of December, 1563, the Bishops were directed to have as their council in the examination of alleged miracles, learned theologians, and other proper persons; and when they [have] made diligent inquisition by sworn witnesses, upon the spot: and those witnesses separately examined, and their depositions separately drawn up: and all hear-say excluded; no deposition being allowed to contain any but direct testimony of what fell under the senses of the witness: and proper persons skilled in the natural philosophy having been consulted: if, upon a review of the whole case deliberately made, the Bishop should be satisfied of the truth of the facts and of their miraculous nature, he transmits a certified copy of the process and depositions to the Holy See for more full examination. In Rome, it is laid before the Congregation of Cardinals specially appointed for such examination, having attached to them one or more lawyers and phy-

sicians, whose duty it is by the closest scrutiny to try whether there be any defect in the evidence as to the fact, or whether, the facts being admitted, their truth will admit of any explanation that will destroy their miraculous character. Should they pass this ordeal, the depositions are sealed up, and kept together with the certificates of the two tribunals, and at the end of fifty or of one hundred years, they are opened and laid, together with any additional evidence which might have been procured, for or against the facts, and examined with equal scrutiny by a tribunal of persons who without the heat of enthusiasm, the partiality of a former expression of opinion, or any other undue motive to sway them, now calmly review the two former examinations, hearing all the arguments of ingenious counsel against the facts, and having for their light the aid of any progress which might in the interval have been made in science, and they pronounce before God, as they will answer to him, a solemn final judgment upon the case. It is true then, as Doctor Paley wrote that "the very best attested of our Popish miracles are extracted from the certificates that are exhibited during the process of the canonization of our saints, a ceremony which seldom takes place till a century after their deaths," but it is not true as he insinuates, that those certificates are not "cotemporary history;" they are cotemporary history of the best kind. Thus the doctor taught falsehoods whilst he wrote disguised truth, and in the support of his second proposition of his first part, he has all through exhibited the most ingenious ability in the perversion of truth, to avoid a formidable difficulty.

I shall now examine a few of the special examples brought by Doctor Paley to illustrate his principle. He says the principle "applies also with considerable force to some of the miracles of the third century." To make his argument conclusive, he ought to have written all the miracles, for if any one of them is proved, the proof of that one will suffice: thus his disproving twenty would not destroy our position, provided we should succeed in proving the truth of even one, for we could argue thus, upon the doctor's own principle. The working of a miracle is evidence of God's commission for the revelation or the confirmation of truth. But here is the plain proof that a miracle has been wrought. Therefore, here is plain proof of God's testimony, for revelation or confirmation. Thus, although the proof of several might be defective, the proof of one will be sufficient. The archdeacon proceeds: "especially to one extraordinary instance, the account of Gregory, Bishop of Neocæsarea, called Thaumaturgus, delivered in the writings of Gregory of Nyssen, who lived one hundred and thirty years after the subject of his panegyric."

Now I would merely remark, that if the question was, whether upon

the evidence which we now possess, of the miracles wrought by the Bishop of Neocæsarea, taken in a sole and isolated way, we were called upon to determine the truth or falsehood of the doctrines of our Church, perhaps that proof would not be fully sufficient. But such is not the case: we do not claim that our doctrines are true because they are supported by the testimony of God manifested only in the miracles of this holy man and of others having no better proof. We will give them up, and also those of hundreds of others, and still we will have hundreds not liable to this objection, nor to any other objection of any weight: and upon those we will found one of our arguments, that if miracles prove the truth of Christianity, they also prove the truth of our Church.

But it will not be the loss of time to examine the archdeacon's assertions somewhat more closely.—1st. St. Gregory of Neocæsarea died in 271; Gregory of Nyssa was chosen Bishop of his see in 372, after having assisted his brother, St. Basil, who was Archbishop of Cæsarea; Basil was born in the year 329, between Basil and Gregory was a brother named Naucratius; probably Gregory was not less than forty years of age when he was chosen bishop; thus between the death of one Gregory and the birth of the other, there did not intervene half the period of one hundred and thirty years. The latter Gregory was born in Cæsarea of Cappadocia, between which place and Neocæsarea in Pontus there was no extraordinary distance: and his father's family were living in Pontus: Nyssa, not Nyssen, of which he was bishop, was in Cappadocia; thus between the time and place of the residence of Thaumaturgus and his panegyrist, there was no extraordinary distance. Gregory Thaumaturgus was no obscure personage. His parents were eminent for their rank and fortune in the city of Neocæsarea; they were not Christians; their daughter being married to the assistant governor of Cæsarea in Palestine, Gregory and his brother Athenodorus, went to stay with her for a time; they attended a famous school of Roman law in the neighborhood of Berytus, and were subsequently disciples of the famous Origen, during his sojourn in Cæsarea; Gregory also studied Platonic philosophy and physics at Alexandria in Egypt, and upon his return to Pontus, he not only was a Christian, but eminent for piety. Phedimus, archbishop of Amasea and metropolitan of Pontus, prevailed upon him to undertake the episcopal charge of his native city, in which there were only, as we are informed, seventeen believers. A vast number of miracles are said to have been wrought by him: and the public statements were, that their evidence was so great, that it was the principal cause of the conversion of the whole city and its vicinity. The fact of the conversion is not contested, nor is it contested, that the public testimony was, that the con-

version was the consequence of miracles. Nor is the fact contested, that ever since, he has been known through the Christian world, by the name of Thaumaturgus, or worker of miracles. Those facts are and have been notorious. St. Gregory of Nyssa had very excellent opportunities of examination upon the spot; he describes to us some of the documents which in his time were preserved in the archives of the Church of Neocæsarea, and which had been left there by its founder. He then spoke of a public series of facts, which he asserts were notoriously true, in the vicinity of the place where those facts occurred, and some of the monuments of the miracles to which they relate being as he states in existence; and others testify without contradiction, at a subsequent period by two or three centuries, that the monuments still existed as evidence of the facts; and the generation who witnessed the facts and testified to their successors, having yet scarcely disappeared from the place when Gregory of Nyssa flourished. But a stronger circumstance remains to be observed upon, which is, that although only the account of Gregory of Nyssa has been transmitted to us, yet it by no means follows that this is the first history which was written. The question is concerning a public fact, or rather a series of public facts, well known in the place, and at the time, and having full evidence of truth when the record which we possess was penned; but a variety of circumstances make it clear, that although this is perhaps the oldest document which we possess, yet it is not the oldest which was drawn up. The question is easily solved by asking, whether Gregory of Nyssa could have been deceived in his inquiry, and whether he would or could have imposed upon the credulity of his flock; and how did it occur, that a vast number of other flocks in the vicinity were similarly persuaded. Archdeacon Paley has been very uncandid, for he has not stated the fact accurately, nor is it upon even such facts we build our argument.[5]

Paley's next exemplification is the following:

"The value of this circumstance is shown to have been accurately exemplified in the history of Ignatius Loyola, founder of the order of Jesuits.[6] His life, written by a companion of his, and by one of the order, was published about fifteen years after his death. In which life, the author, so far from ascribing any miracles to Ignatius, industriously

[5] Vid. S. Grey. Nyss. *de Vit. B. Grey. Mirac.* Opif. Orat. opp. Tom. 1, Ed. Morell, p. 916.

Of one of the miraculous events in the life of S. Gregory, the Protestant Bishop Bull thus writes: "No one should think it incredible that such a providence should befall a man whose whole life was conspicuous for revelations and miracles, as all ecclesiastical writers who have mentioned him, (and who has not,) witness with one voice."—*Defens. Fid. Nic.* ii. 12, cited in *Essay on Development*, p. 180.

[6] Douglas's *Criterion of Miracles*, p. 74.

states the reasons why he was not invested with any such power. The life was republished fifteen years afterwards, with the addition of many circumstances, which were the fruit, the author says, of further inquiry, and of diligent examination; but still, with a total silence about miracles. When Ignatius had been dead nearly sixty years, the Jesuits conceiving a wish to have the founder of their order placed in the Roman calendar, began, as it should seem, for the first time, to attribute to him a catalogue of miracles, which could not then be distinctly disproved; and which there was, in those who governed the Church, a strong disposition to admit upon the slenderest proofs."

Paley refers to Douglas, who only takes up a refuted objection of Bayle; and thus the archdeacon's argument to exclude Popery is without any good grounds. Let us examine the facts of the assertion. "In which life, the author, so far from ascribing any miracles to Ignatius, industriously states the reasons why he was not invested with any such power." Any person reading this passage, would naturally suppose that Ribadiniera, who is the biographer referred to, asserted that Ignatius did not work any miracles: such is evidently the meaning insinuated by Paley. Yet no such assertion is made: the expression is, *Quamobrem illius sanctitas* minus *est testata miraculis.*—"Wherefore his sanctity is *less* proved by miracles." Producing a *smaller* quantity, is by no means omitting to produce any quantity, and still less is it asserting *no* quantity of evidence could be produced. But in truth the minus does not appear to refer to the quantity of the miracles, but to place the evidence of sanctity, by inference from miracles, in minor distinction to the direct evidence of sanctity exhibited in conduct. This is no denial of the existence of miracles, but the assertion of a more plain and higher species of direct proof. Ribadiniera in the last chapter, page 209, of the first edition, denies beforehand the truth of the archdeacon's assertion in two very effectual ways. *Mihi tantum abest ut ad vitam Ignatii illustrandam* miracula *deesse videantur, ut* multa *eaque* præstantissima *judicem in luce versari.* "So far am I from believing that there exists any want of *miracles* to illustrate the life of Ignatius, that I would judge that *many* and those of the *best description* are plainly evident." How could Bayle, or Douglas, or Paley assert that this man stated that Ignatius *wrought no miracles*? The second mode of contradicting Paley's assertion is given in that same chapter, where he recapitulates several miraculous facts which he had already stated in his narrative. This first history was published in 1572. The same author did, fifteen years after, viz. in 1587, publish the history of the life of Ignatius with some additions; but it is not true as the achdeacon asserts, "still with a total

silence about miracles." Nor is his next insinuation true, that nothing more was done until sixty years after his death: for the same author shortly after this second edition, published a Latin abstract of the first compilation which is styled *Alteram breviorem vitam, sed* multis ac novis miraculis *auctam.* "Another shorter life but augmented by *many and new miracles.*" In this he states that he was cautious before of relating miracles, which though duly testified, had not been as yet duly and fully examined and approved, and that those which he did previously relate were selected by the judgment of prudent persons; being but a few of those which were commonly testified and believed. Of course there is no truth whatever in the assertion of Paley that when Ignatius had been dead nearly sixty years, the Jesuits began for the first time to attribute to him a catalogue of miracles which could not then be distinctly disproved. He died in 1556. All the cotemporary historians tell us that the people esteemed him a saint even before his death; and that their opinion was upheld amongst other testimony, by miracles. In 1572, an intimate companion of his selects from amongst many and those of the best description of miracles, some which he specifies in his book which is published. In 1587, a new edition with additions, is published by the same author, afterwards an abridgment of the first, with many new miracles added, is published: the writer states that a reason for not having inserted many of those at an earlier period was caution, until the proofs of the fact and the nature of the works should have been more closely examined. In 1604, the same author prints again an account of the life of Ignatius amongst his *Lives of Holy Persons.* This was in Spanish; and he states "Though when I first printed his life in 1572, I knew some miracles of the holy father, I did not look upon them to be so verified by process (*averiguados*) as to think I ought to publish them, but they were afterwards fully proved by credible witnesses to be true, during the authentical process taken in order to his canonization; and the Lord who was pleased to exalt him, and make him glorious on earth, daily works, on his account, such miracles as to oblige me here to relate them; taken from the original juridicial informations which several bishops have taken and from the depositions made on oath of the persons upon whom they were wrought," and so forth.

Thus we have public, common testimony during his life; and after his death, we have the written testimony of his biographer to the general proposition and to some special facts, fifteen years after his death. But those facts had been examined at the time, though not judicially established even as yet, though the evidences and certificates, and the processes were preserved. The law of the Council of Trent, which had

closed but a few years before, prevented their hasty publication; within the space of thirty years the whole is re-asserted, after more mature examination, new developments are made, and the former certificates and inquiries are made now available, and another publication with additional evidence and new facts appears: in 1604, within 40 years after his death, extracts are made from the authenticated and maturely examined depositions and informations, and new testimonies of recent miracles are added. With all this accumulation of facts before us, what are we to say of Archdeacon Paley, who asserts that it was not until nearly sixty years after his death, which would be about 1616, that miracles began to be first attributed to Ignatius? The documents having been fully substantiated and tested, application was made for the examination of the evidence in Rome, now that it had passed the scrutiny of several other tribunals. In 1609, after mature examination, Pope Paul V. admitted the sufficiency of the evidence. Again in 1622, Gregory XV. heard the report of the Cardinal de Monte and the other commissioners, who examined the evidence after a re-examination at the tribunal of the Rota, and a review of that examination by the Congregation of Rites. Upon the hearing of the report, the Pope Gregory gave his full assent in that year, and in 1623, Pope Urban VIII. published the bull of canonization. I shall merely ask, whether if Paley knew those facts, he was candid and honest in the construction of his sentence. If Paley, who was originally educated a Protestant and who only copied Douglas, as Douglas followed Bayle, might perhaps have been excusably ignorant, surely White can have no such excuse. If then Paley had led him to believe that a miracle was evidence of revelation, he must have been the most illiterate Catholic clergyman, that could be ordinarily met with, if he did not see that the Roman Catholic religion was revealed by God: for it possesses the most indubitable proofs of a succession of miracles. In the very case of St. Ignatius adduced by Paley, so far from being true as he asserts, that nearly sixty years had elapsed before the Jesuits began to attribute miracles to him, the sixty-six years which intervened between his death and his canonization were marked by close and extensive inquiries into the truth of several miracles, which were frequently published and kept under the public view. Of this it is barely possible, charitably to suppose Paley ignorant; but White could not have been ignorant of the fact unless he was a grossly ignorant priest. I care not which side of the alternative the accumulating phalanx of our reverend opponents will take: they are welcome to choose. But I shall proceed to examine Paley still farther, to show that he could not make

White resume a belief in the truth of Christianity, without causing him to embrace Catholicism.

I remain yours,

B. C.

LETTER IX.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 30, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends—I shall in this letter continue my examination of Dr. Paley's alleged reasons why the principle, that although miracles prove revelation, they ought not to prove Catholicism, is to be held. You will recollect, that this reasoning is founded upon the assumption that no miracle in favor of Catholicism exists; my assertion is that Mr. White had evidence of the existence of many such miracles, and that if he therefore believed Paley's principle that miracles prove revelation, he ought to have become a Roman Catholic, and farther that he must, if he had been a well instructed Roman Catholic, have seen that Paley was guilty of several falsehoods in his attempt to avoid the conclusion "that Catholicism must be a divine institution, if Christianity is a divine institution;" because the reasons which prove the one prove the other. It was for this purpose that in my last letter I examined Paley, and for this purpose I now continue the examination.

Under the second head of chapter i, prop. ii, part i, the archdeacon says of miracles, "We may leave out of the case, accounts published in one country, of what passed in a different country, without any proof that such accounts were known and received at home." With this principle I fully agree; because the account of the miracle is the account of a fact, and the fact must necessarily be first known, and received as truth, where it occurred, and it then travels abroad with authority. But the principle has its main value in its last clause, *without any proof that such accounts were known and received at home*, for certainly, the mere publication in one country of what passed in a distant country, would be no reason for disbelieving the truth of the occurrence; otherwise, the archdeacon could not expect that any person in England should believe that Moses caused water to gush forth miraculously from a rock in Arabia. The whole force of the principle is then found in the clause which I have marked in *italics*.

The archdeacon thus exemplifies. "Those miracles of Francis Xavier, the Indian missionary, with many others of the *Romish Breviary*, are liable to the same objection, viz: that the accounts of them were pub-

lished at a vast distance from the supposed scene of the wonders." We have seen that the bare publication at a distance from the scene of action is not the jet of the principle which Paley laid down, yet in his phrase, this is the only circumstance which he objects to the miracles of this saint; therefore, as logicians would say, he has changed his middle term, than which a more ingenious or discreditable artifice could scarcely be used. His fallacy in such a case would be enough to convict him of deliberate dishonesty: to save him from which, we must suppose he meant, that those miracles of St. Francis Xavier which were published at a vast distance from the scene of action, were not known or received as truths in India, and in Japan, where they were said to have occurred.

We are thus brought to a simple inquiry regarding the fact of their having been known and received as true, where they are stated to have occurred: if they were so received, the archdeacon is erroneous; if they were not, we must give up the miracles. Let us therefore examine: I shall give but an outline, which I shall at any time that the cause of truth may require it, be ready to fill up. In the years 1542, and 1543, the miracles of St. Francis Xavier were so well known and received as truths at Cape Comorin, that in consequence of their splendid evidence, the prince of that region, on their account, gave leave to his people to change their religion and to become members of the Church, and vast numbers, amongst whom were many of the principal inhabitants, consequently became Christians of the Catholic Church. In the year 1543, upon the Pearl Coast, he procured the conversion of vast numbers, and the respect of others, and the hatred of many, by his miracles, amongst which were the raising to life of four dead persons. In 1544 and 1545, in the kingdom of Travancor he received the gift of tongues, so that he preached and instructed, and familiarly conversed in languages which he had never previously heard spoken. The very fact of which was testified by the people to whom he preached, and by the consequences of his preaching, in their conversion and reformation. At Coulon, a village in Travancor, near Cape Comorin, when the people did not appear disposed to conversion by his preaching, after a short prayer, he caused them to open a grave, in which a body had been interred by them on the previous day, and which body was now putrifying and emitting a noisome stench, and commanding the dead man to arise in the name of the living God, he was restored to life, and the people were converted, and demanded baptism; he also in the same kingdom raised to life a young man, a Christian, whose friends were bearing the body to interment: those facts were so notorious, and so far believed and received as to produce the conversion of the great bulk of the people in the course of a few months, in

those years. In 1549, he publicly restored to life a young pagan lady of quality, who had been dead during an entire day, and by his blessing restored a deformed child to beauty, in Maxuma in Japan; the consequences of which miracles were several conversions. In 1550, at Amanguchi, in Japan, he had the gift of tongues, speaking several new languages to persons of nations in whose tongues he had never been instructed. In 1552, he restored to life at Malacca, a young man named Francis Ciavos, who afterwards became a member of the society of Jesuits. This fact was notorious and received at the place. King John III, of Portugal, ordered, besides the usual examinations which the Church requires, as mentioned in my last letter, that the depositions should be taken, and the examinations made in several places, and a process of the whole drawn up at Goa; the examination was made in the several places, and the results were transmitted to Europe. Subsequent travellers and missionaries found in all the places the most satisfactory evidence of the miracles amongst the people. The miracles themselves are known in the several places to have been the principal cause of the conversion of vast numbers, who became martyrs, and of the creation of the Churches which still in many of those places subsist and preserve the testimonials. I avow to you that no effort which ever has been made to destroy or to discredit evidence, appears to me more barefaced and desperate, than that of Paley, when he asserts that the miracles of "Francis Xavier, the Indian missionary," belonged to that class which were "published in one country as having passed in a distant country, without any proof that such accounts were known or received at home." I was confounded and shocked when I read it. I saw, of course that he had a desperate game to play, but when I reflected upon this passage, all my respect for Archdeacon Paley vanished: and I still lament that so clear a head should have had recourse to so unprincipled a mode of sustaining any cause. It is true that Paley endeavors to escape upon the shoulders of Douglas, to whose work he refers: but for a man who had to treat of so important a subject, such a reference is no excuse. White is still less excusable, because if he had paid one particle of attention to his own early studies, he must have seen how flagrantly erroneous was Paley's statement, and of course how inconclusive his argument. Did Bishop Kemp ever take the trouble of examining our evidence of those facts?

Doctor Paley, in his section vii, of the same chapter, has the following passage:

"We have laid out of the case those accounts which require no more than a simple assent; and we now also lay out of the case those

which come merely in affirmance of opinions already formed. This last circumstance it is of the utmost importance to notice well. It has long been observed, that Popish miracles happen in Popish countries; that they make no converts; which proves that stories are accepted, when they fall in with principles already fixed, with the public sentiments, or with sentiments of a party already engaged on the side the miracle supports, which would not be attempted to be produced in the face of enemies, in opposition to reigning tenets or favorite prejudices, or when, if they be believed, the belief must draw men away from their preconceived and habitual opinions, from their modes of life and rules of action. In the former case, men may not only receive a miraculous account, but may both act and suffer on the side, and in the cause, which the miracle supports, yet not act or suffer for the miracle, but in pursuance of a prior persuasion. The miracle, like any other argument which only confirms what was before believed, is admitted with little examination. In the moral, as in the natural world, it is change which requires a cause. Men are easily fortified in their old opinions, driven from them with great difficulty. Now how does this apply to the Christian history? The miracles there recorded, were wrought in the midst of enemies, under a government, a priesthood, and a magistracy, decidedly and vehemently adverse to them, and to the pretensions which they supported. They were Protestant miracles in a Popish country; they were Popish miracles in the midst of Protestants. They produced a change; they established a society upon the spot, adhering to the belief of them; they made converts; and those who were converted gave up to the testimony their most fixed opinions and most favorite prejudices. They who acted and suffered in the cause, acted and suffered for their miracles: for there was no anterior persuasion to induce them, prior reverence, prejudice, or partiality to take hold of. Jesus had not one follower when he set up his claim. His miracles gave birth to his sect. No part of his description belongs to the ordinary evidence of Heathen or Popish miracles. Even most of the miracles alleged to have been performed by Christians, in the second and third centuries of its æra, want this confirmation. It constitutes indeed a line of partition between the origin and the progress of Christianity. Frauds and fallacies might mix themselves with the progress, which could not possibly take place in the commencement of the religion; at least, according to any laws of human conduct that we are acquainted with. What should suggest to the first propagators of Christianity, especially to fishermen, tax-gatherers, and husbandmen, such a thought as that of changing the religion of the world; what could bear them through the difficulties in which the attempt engaged them;

what could procure any degree of success to the attempt; are questions which apply with great force, to the setting out of the institution, with less, to every future stage of it."

In this the writer evidently forgets both himself and history; he also lays down a principle which is untrue, or the Scriptures of the old law are false records, and Mr. White ought to have seen this if he was a theologian. I shall dwell a short time upon this latter proposition of the archdeacon, that we are to leave out of the case all those miracles which come merely "in affirmance of opinions already formed," and which "circumstance it is of the utmost importance to notice well." The conclusion which the archdeacon would have us to draw, is necessarily, that when a person says that he is commissioned to work a miracle, to affirm the truth of a doctrine previously received, we need not inquire whether a miracle is wrought or not, but we must disbelieve him altogether. Therefore, in plain fact, we must never believe that a miracle has been wrought since the days of the Apostles, and so says the Doctor: for he says, "even most of the miracles alleged to have been performed by Christians in the second and third centuries, want this confirmation." Here is the consciousness of a bad cause manifestly exhibited in the vagueness of the expression most of the miracles. Why not boldly say, all of them, if his position is a good one; or specify some mode by which we may be able to say definitely and decisively which of the alleged miracles we ought to examine? I assert that we ought to examine every alleged miracle, whether of the first or of the nineteenth century, and [that] we have no power to tell the Almighty that he shall not make a revelation to us at one time, as well as at another; and I assert that the proof of the truth of the miracle is to be found in its own nature, and not in the circumstance of the time at which it is wrought. There is nothing in the nature of things, or in the nature of religion to make it impossble for God to do now works similar to those done by him at any former time. The examiner has only to ascertain two points: first, whether this event occurred: secondly, whether the occurrence could have taken place without God's special intervention beyond the effects of his natural law. The first he ascertains by ordinary testimony, the second he ascertains by the common belief of competent persons as to what the law of nature cannot reach to. Paley's other distinction is arbitrary and unfounded, viz. that a miracle is unnecessary for the confirmation of truth already known; if he means that this truth is known and believed by all persons, and that there exists no danger of a loss of truth, and of a relapse into error, such a case is metaphysical: yet even in this supposition, God might, in his wisdom, think it as neces-

sary to confirm for one generation, that truth which had been previously revealed to a former race, as to prove its original revelation to an antecedent people. Besides, there has in fact been no age in which it was not necessary to make truth manifest to infidels.

But the scriptural facts are all against the archdeacon. The Jewish people in Egypt were not an infidel race: yet we find a series of miracles wrought to confirm them in the belief of those doctrines which they had received by tradition from their fathers, as well as to prove the legation of Moses. They received no new doctrines at Sinai; they only received a religious organization, and had a ritual law imposed upon them. But suppose that the miracles wrought at Sinai were to shew them that this organization and this ritual ought to be submitted to and preserved; according to Paley, the people of Israel ought to put out of the case every alleged miracle "in affirmance of opinions thus already formed," and therefore all the miracles related in the books of Josue, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, the Prophets, and so forth, to the end of the old law, "ought to be put out of the case." Here is a pretty sweeping of some hundreds of miracles from the sacred records, or else the archdeacon's principle is as irreligious as it is unphilosophical. All those miracles were wrought in affirmance of doctrines, not opinions already believed, not formed. Doctor Paley ought to have known that faith does not allow the formation of an opinion, but requires simple acceptance and unhesitating belief of the doctrine which God reveals. What we are taught by heaven is not opinion; opinion is of our own formation. I should like to know what the Doctor would advise in case that I were one of five hundred who saw a man raised from the dead in affirmance of faith. Would he tell me that such a supposition is absurdity, because miracles are not wrought now, that his principles must be true, that there must be some error, though he could not point it out? Yet he should give up his principle or make this assertion: if he makes this assertion, how will he answer Voltaire or Hume, who tell him exactly the same regarding the miracles which he adduces to prove Christianity? Thus have good gentlemen destroyed the foundations of revelation by attempting to subvert Catholicism.

But I cannot rest here. The Doctor's principle is false or the Bible is a tissue of falsehoods: and still more, Paley asserts what is not true, if he asserts that the miracles wrought in our Church in the several ages were wrought merely in affirmance of opinion already formed. Was this the character of the miracles of St. Francis Xavier? Were not his miracles wrought, as were those of the apostles, to effect the conversion of unbelievers? Was this the characteristic of those of St. Gregory Thauma-

turgus? Were they not wrought for the conversion of the infidel people of Neocæsarea? Did they not in each case produce the same effect? Such, too, was the case in thousands of instances of the best authenticated miracles which have taken place in our Church in every age from the days of the Apostles to the present day; in accordance with the promises of the Saviour, given without any limitation of time, as may be seen in a variety of places, as [for instance] in the *Gospel of St. Mark*, xvi, 17-18, "And these signs shall follow them that believe: in my name, they shall cast out devils: they shall speak with new tongues: they shall take up serpents: and if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them: they shall lay their hands upon the sick and they shall recover." These were miracles wrought in an infidel country; they were not in a Popish country, as the archdeacon is pleased to be rude and uncivil in his nicknames. Mr. White ought to have known that Popish miracles have been frequently wrought in the midst of Protestants, as well as of infidels, and therefore that Paley's assertion was untrue. Mr. White's American sponsors have attempted, and a most miserable and abortive attempt it was, to get rid of a fact which I believe to be palpably miraculous, though I am not authorized officially to publish it as such, which took place in their own city. I would this day, after all their leisure for examination, ask them, was Mrs. Mattingly, of the city of Washington, instantaneously healed from an incurable disorder not three years since? I assert that she was: and I call upon the reverend gentleman to produce, in the whole Union, any physician of a reputable character, who will, to a plain statement of the facts of her cure, affix his certificate that such a cure can be accounted for by any natural process, or could take place without being miraculous. Mr. Hawley knows also that conversions took place in consequence of this cure.

In the commencement of his first chapter, prop. ii, part 1, Paley says:

"If the reformers in the time of Wickliffe, or of Luther, or those of England, in the time of Henry the Eighth, or of Queen Mary; or the founders of our religious sects since, such as were Mr. Whitefield and Mr. Wesley in our own times; had undergone the life of toil and exertion, of danger and of sufferings, which we know that many of them did undergo for a miraculous story; that is to say, if they had founded their public ministry upon the allegation of miracles wrought within their own knowledge, and upon narratives which could not be resolved into delusion or mistake; and if it appeared, that their conduct really had its origin in these accounts, I should have believed them."

Now the archdeacon cannot complain of my asserting that it is as

necessary in many cases to work a miracle to preserve truth formerly delivered, as to establish it originally, when I shew its necessity from the nature of the case, and the authority of scripture. I shall give but an outline and a fact. Suppose in those times to which he alludes, the whole body of the professors of Christianity had swerved from the truth, and that King Henry or Martin Luther was commissioned to bring them back to pure doctrine and virtuous conduct, would they not have as difficult a task in converting [them from] Romish idolatry as the first Apostles had in converting the former pagans? Suppose those virtuous reformers to have been wrong, but still successful in deluding many, would not the miracles be as necessary to preserve the faith of the just, and to confound the apostates, as it was in the days of Elias, when he wrought so many to confirm the faithful Jews, and to confound those who had apostatised? Why then would the archdeacon not believe a miracle wrought in support of the truth of the old religion, as he would if it could be wrought against it? He gives us his reason in a subsequent passage in the second paragraph of section vii. of the same chapter:

"Hath any founder of a new sect among Christians pretended to miraculous power, and succeeded by his pretensions?" "Were these powers claimed or exercised by the founders of the sects of the Waldenses and Albigenses? Did Wickliffe in England pretend to it? Did Huss or Jerome in Bohemia? Did Luther in Germany, Zwinglius in Switzerland, Calvin in France, or any of the Reformers, advance this plea? The French prophets, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, ventured to allege miraculous evidence, and immediately ruined their cause by their temerity."

So, then, because no miracles were wrought by the opponents of the Church, we are to say they were not wrought in the Church. When Paley, quoting from Campbell, asks, "Did Calvin advance this plea?" I answer that he did, and made a most deplorable failure. For, in attempting to revive a sleeping tailor, he killed him. If Mr. White had been even partially instructed, he could not but see that all the attempts of Paley to overthrow the evidence in favor of Catholicism were abortive.

In the same chapter, under the head of appreciating the miracles from their own nature, the archdeacon, in section iii, ranks under the head of doubtful whether they were miraculous, admitting the truth of the phenomenon, "the extraordinary circumstances which obstructed the re-building of the temple at Jerusalem by Julian." Doctor Warburton, and several other eminent Protestant divines, admit fully and maintain their miraculous nature; but as the occurence took place about the middle of the fourth century, this period is far too late for the arch-

deacon. He therefore contradicts, upon the subject, besides a whole host of his own divines, St. Cyril, then Bishop of Jerusalem, who was present and who foretold that the obstruction would take place, St. Gregory Nazianzen, who in the next year wrote a description of this miracle, St. John Chrysostom, who about twenty years after testified its miraculous nature, and made solemn and public appeals founded thereon, St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, a cotemporary who wrote upon the subject in the year 388, Rufinus, who lived upon the spot, Theodoret, who lived in the vicinity, together with Arians and Pagans; and any person of common observation must acknowledge, if he believes the truth of the fact, that it was necessarily miraculous.

In the same paragraph the archdeacon has, upon the authority of Justin,

"The miracles of the second and third century are, usually healing the sick, and casting out evil spirits, miracles in which there is room for some error or deception. We hear nothing of causing the blind to see, the lame to walk, the deaf to hear, the lepers to be cleansed."

The incident to the first of those propositions carries with it the refutation of the principle sought to be established. That principle is, that healing the sick or casting out evil spirits, is not a miracle, yet the incident allows that they are miracles, but only states that there is room for error or deception. But if the evidence of the fact be so strong as to leave no room for error or deception, there can be no question of the truth of the fact itself. If the fact be true, there is an admission of the truth of the miracle, thus as there is equally strong evidence to prove that those facts occurred in the second and third ages as to prove that they occurred in the first, there is equal proof of the existence of miracles in the second and third ages as in the first age. If there were not miracles in those latter ages, there is no reason for stating them to be miracles when related in the gospel. Thus will the archdeacon, by endeavoring to destroy the proofs of Catholicism, destroy the proofs of Christianity: and thus Mr. White ought to have seen that if miracles established the one, they establish the other. Hence, if the principles of Paley converted him to Christianity, they ought to have brought him back to Catholicism.

The second proposition of the extract is a manifest untruth: for the histories of the second and third ages abound in proofs of the restoration of sight, of hearing, of limbs, and even of life itself. White ought to have known this, and other great drawbacks, upon Paley's work, some of which I shall exhibit in my next.

I remain yours, B. C.

LETTER X.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 6, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends—If Mr. White had been a well informed Roman Catholic, he would have seen, as I have shewn, that Archdeacon Paley was either very grossly deceived, or wilfully endeavored to delude his readers, in his accounts of our miraculous facts; he would have seen full evidence for a multitude of those facts in the Roman Catholic Church, in every age, from that of the Apostles to the present day. If, therefore, he believed the principle with which the archdeacon set out, viz. that miracles were proof of revelation, and revelation the evidence of God's testimony, Mr. White must have seen that God's testimony was in favor of the Roman Catholic Church; and if he followed Paley's train of argument, he must, as soon as he discovered the truth of those evident facts, have become a Roman Catholic: or if he did not, he must have rejected the principle which being connected with those facts led inevitably to this result: and thus he must have come back to what he testifies to be the undoubted principle of Catholicism, *Doblado's Letters*, page 296: "According to their undoubted principles on this matter, they must have been either Catholics or Infidels." This must be the case with every person who reasons consistently upon the principles of Paley, and who discovers the facts which we say are supported by irrefragable evidence. I need not dwell here upon the exemplification, but this conclusion will flow inevitably from a great variety of other arguments.

I come now to examine another portion of Paley's production, to shew that White had in that work, full evidence of the insincerity or ignorance of the writer. I can scarcely assert that Paley was ignorant, yet this would be an apology which I should prefer admitting to save him from the alternative, and indeed it is the only plea which could save him. In his second chapter, supporting the second proposition of his first part, he proceeds under the pretext of refuting the objections of Infidels, really to sap the foundations of the Catholic Church, but the attempt was made in a manner equally discreditable as it is futile. He adduces three instances of alleged miracles in support of error: which Mr. Hume objects to, as being untrue in fact, and yet apparently being as well supported by evidence as any of the miracles which attest the truth of Christianity.

With the first, viz. "The cure of a blind and of a lame man at Alexandria, by the Emperor Vespasian, as related in Tacitus," we have no concern. The other two are those which having been introduced as

our best miracles by Mr. Hume, and permitted to pass as such by Paley, call for our consideration. "The restoration of the limb of an attendant in a Spanish church, as told by Cardinal de Retz;" and "The cures said to be performed at the tomb of the Abbe Paris, in the beginning of the present (the last) century."

Respecting the first of those, Paley writes:

"The story taken from the Memoirs of Cardinal de Retz, which is the second example alleged by Mr. Hume, is this: 'In the church of Saragossa in Spain, the canons showed me a man whose business it was to light the lamps; telling me, that he had been several years at the gate with one leg only. I saw him with two.' "[7]

"It is stated by Mr. Hume, that the Cardinal, who relates this story, did not believe it: and it nowhere appears, that he either examined the limb, or asked the patient, or indeed any one, a single question about the matter. An artificial leg, wrought with art, would be sufficient, in a place where no such contrivance had ever before been heard of, to give origin and currency to the report. The ecclesiastics of the place would, it is probable, favor the story, inasmuch as it advanced the honor of their image and Church. And if they patronised it, no other person at Saragossa, in the middle of the last century, would care to dispute it. The story likewise coincided not less with the wishes and preconceptions of the people, than with the interests of their ecclesiastical rulers: so that there was prejudice backed by authority, and both operating upon extreme ignorance, to account for the success of the imposture. If, as I have suggested, the contrivance of an artificial limb was then new, it would not occur to the Cardinal himself to suspect it; especially under the carelessness of mind with which he heard the tale, and the little inclination he felt to scrutinize or expose its fallacy."

Mr. White knew that it was not upon such evidence as this, the Church to which he had belonged rested her miracles; he knew, that here, there might or there might not, have been a miracle, according as the truth was, or was not related; but he also knew that the logic which was taught in Seville, laid down an axiom, *ab actu ad posse valet consecutio, sed non vice versa,* "you may fairly conclude that what has been done is possible: but you cannot argue that because a thing is possible it has been done." Fact must rest upon evidence of the senses for the witnesses; upon evidence of testimony, for others. In place of using this opportunity of making an uncharitable, an unfounded, and a calumnious attack upon Romish ecclesiastics; if Paley had been an honest man,

[7] Liv. iv. A. D. 1654.

he would have given a more direct, a more logical, and an amply sufficient answer. "We do not rest our belief of the Christian Religion upon the truth of this fact, but upon the truth of thousands of facts, of each of which we have unquestionable evidence.—Of this we have none; it might be true; but as we have no evidence of its truth, we do not adduce it." But no; this would not answer the archdeacon's purpose, for in truth, his only object and Hume's, so far as regards the two latter facts, was the same, viz. to undermine the evidence of Catholicism, by insinuating that its claim to miraculous testimony in its favor, is built upon unfounded stories.

Let any one examine the extraordinary passage of Paley for a moment, with patience. Cardinal de Retz, it is stated, did not believe the story. Yet the Cardinal was a Roman Catholic: thus the belief of the story is not essential for the truth of our religion. But the canons of the Church would naturally favor the story, though they knew it to be a lie, and if the canons favored it, no person in the city of Saragossa would care to dispute it. If, then, an entire city can, in the middle of the seventeenth century, in the centre of a civilized country in Europe, be found so bereft of all love for truth, so careless of every principle of religion, so perfectly acquiescent to a glaring falsehood, as to believe without examination, in the truth of a stupendous miracle, such as the complete restoration of a deficient limb; or if they did examine, to acquiesce in testifying a notorious falsehood: of what value is history? Of what value is human testimony? Upon what ground does Paley charge every clerical and lay inhabitant of Saragossa with such gross and glaring, foul and abominable irreligion? My friends, did you ever find any Roman Catholic writer so bereft of charity, so void of feeling, so base, as to make such a charge as this, gratuitously, upon the whole body of the Protestant inhabitants of any large and populous city, and then, exhibit by inference this city as a specimen of all other Protestant cities, and this fraud as a correct specimen of the Protestant religion? Yet Paley is said to be a liberal man! God forbid that all the liberality of our Protestant fellow-citizens should be confined to the measure of such liberality as this! To charge the Catholic Clergy with irreligious, with blasphemous deceit; to charge the Catholic Laity with profound ignorance; and to exhibit our religion, as a system of delusion created by the success of such vile imposture—and all gratuitously!! Yet this book of Paley's is put into the hands of the American youth in their colleges, as the book from which they are to learn the proofs of the Christian Religion. Can you now be astonished at the estimation in which we

are held by that portion of our fellow-citizens who have been taught out of this book in those colleges?

I have dwelt long enough upon this very unbecoming passage of Paley. I shall, however, take the liberty of here making a general remark, that so far as regards the special proofs of Catholicism, we may fairly assert in the words of the Saviour, "Whosoever is not with us is against us." There is no person who is not a Catholic, that will not endeavor to destroy the proofs of Catholicism; for that system, in its exclusive truth, can hold no fellowship with any error, and hence we find it attacked alike by the Deist and Atheist, by the Trinitarian and the Unitarian, by the Episcopalian and the Presbyterian, whilst in its isolated strength and grandeur, it stands erect, and uninjured amidst the assaults of all. Thus Hume and Paley could agree in their attack upon our Church, and Paley more ingenious and more powerful than Hume, could in his apparent zeal to demolish the bastions of infidelity, level his artillery at the fortress of Catholicism, and still whilst he poured out his shot, cry that he only sought to level the protection of the unbeliever, whilst his guns were in reality pointed far to its right, and destined for a different object.

As to the second of those cases, the paltry artifice which has so often been resorted to by party writers was beneath the dignity of Paley: his mind should have scorned to stoop to such trick. He knew that the Jansenists were not Catholics, and if he did not, White did. Yet in this place, he insinuates that they were members of the Catholic Church, though opposed by the Jesuits as a party. Thus he would lead his readers to believe that the alleged miracles at the tomb of the Abbe Paris were such as are relied upon by the Catholic Church: whereas the Catholic authorities disproved the allegation of the Jansenists. The Catholics denied and disproved the occurrence of any miracles at the tomb. Hence, neither the case of the man in Saragossa, nor the occurrences at the tomb of the Abbe Paris, can be alleged against us, and our answer is very short and very simple—"We do not adduce them as proofs." The archdeacon was then dishonest in his mode of stating facts, and he was guilty of bad reasoning in drawing general conclusions from particular premises. White ought to have seen both faults, and therefore, if he was converted by the book of Paley, and the evidence of miracles ought to have made him a Christian, the same evidence existed to make him a Catholic; and the attempts of Paley to destroy its force in the latter case, were wholly ineffectual. White knowing the facts which proved the last circumstance, could not by Paley's reasoning be made a Christian, without being made a Catholic. Hence we have

good reason to believe, and I shall yet shew, that he never became a consistent Christian—I shall shew that he did not believe the doctrines of the Church of England.

"The miracles related to have been wrought at the tomb of the Abbe Paris, admit in general of this solution. The patients who frequented the tomb were so affected by their devotion, their expectation, the place, the solemnity, and, above all, by the sympathy of the surrounding multitude, that many of them were thrown into violent convulsions, which convulsions, in certain instances, produced a removal of disorder, depending upon obstruction. We shall, at this day, have the less difficulty in admitting the above account, because it is the very same thing as hath lately been experienced in the operations of animal magnetism: and the report of the French physicians upon that mysterious remedy is very applicable to the present condition, viz. that the pretenders to the art, by working upon the imaginations of their patients, were frequently able to produce convulsions; that convulsions so produced, are amongst the most powerful, but, at the same time, most uncertain and unmanageable applications to the human frame which can be employed.

"Circumstances which indicate this explication in the case of the Parisian miracles are the following:

1. They were tentative. Out of many thousand sick, infirm, and diseased persons, who resorted to the tomb, the professed history of the miracles contains only nine cures.

2. The convulsions at the tomb are admitted.

3. The diseases were, for the most part, of that sort which depends upon inaction and obstruction, as dropsies, palsies, and some tumors.

4. The cures were gradual; some patients attending many days, some several weeks, and some several months.

5. The cures were many of them incomplete.

6. Others were temporary.

"So that all the wonder we are called upon to account for is, that out of an almost innumerable multitude which resorted to the tomb for the cure of their complaints, and many of whom were there agitated by strong convulsions, a very small proportion experienced a beneficial change in their constitution, especially in the action of the nerves and glands.

"Some of the cases alleged do not require that we should have recourse to this solution. The first case in the catalogue is scarcely distinguishable from the progress of a natural recovery. It was that of a young man who labored under an inflammation of one eye, and had lost the sight of the other. The inflamed eye was relieved, but the

blindness of the other remained. The inflammation had before been abated by medicine; and the young man at the time of his attendance at the tomb, was using a lotion of laudanum. And, what is still a more material part of the case, the inflammation after some interval returned. Another case was that of a young man who had lost his sight by the puncture of an awl, and the discharge of the aqueous humor through the wound. The sight, which had been gradually returning, was much improved during his visit to the tomb, that is, probably, in the same degree in which the discharged humor was replaced by fresh secretions. And it is observable, that these two are the only cases which, from their nature, should seem unlikely to be affected by convulsions."

But the most discreditable assertion of Paley's remains.

These, let us remember, are the *strongest examples*, which the history of ages supplies.

To White, this single proposition ought to have stamped Paley's book with irrevocable condemnation. So far from being the *strongest examples*, they are *no examples*. We have, and White must have known it, hundreds of splendid examples of miracles, whose truth is supported by incontestable proofs, and we reject those which Hume and Paley adduce. But a bold assertion is not always the worst ally in a bad cause.

I have done with Paley, and must resume White.

I remain, yours, B. C.

LETTER XI.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 13, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends—A more blundering passage of obscure phraseology seldom came under my view than that in which Mr. White endeavors to show how an infidel cannot recognize the force of miraculous evidence. It is the following:

"I learnt that the author of the *Natural Theology* had also written a work on the *Evidences of Christianity*, and curiosity led me to read it. His arguments appeared to me very strong; but I found an intrinsic incredibility in the facts of revealed history, which no general evidence seemed able to remove. I was indeed laboring under what I believe to be a very common error in this matter—an error which I have not been able completely to correct, without a very long study of the subject and myself. I expected that general evidence would remove the natural inverisimilitude of miraculous events: that, being convinced by un-

answerable arguments that Christ and his disciples could be neither impostors nor enthusiasts, and that the narrative of their ministry is genuine and true, the imagination would not shrink from forms of things so dissimilar to its own representations of real objects, and so comformable in appearance with the tricks of jugglers and impostors. Now the fact is, that *probably and likely*, though used as synonymous in common language, are perfectly distinct in philosophy. The *probable* is that for the reality of which we can allege some reason; the *likely*, that which bears in its face a semblance or analogy to what is classed in our minds under the predicament of existence.[8] This association is made early in life, among Christians, in favor of the miraculous events recorded in the Holy Scriptures; and, if not broken by infidelity in after life, the study of the Gospel evidence gives those events a character of reality which leaves the mind satisfied and at rest; because it finds the history of revealed religion not only *probable*, but *likely*. It is much otherwise with a man who rejects the Gospel for a considerable period, and accustoms his mind to rank the supernatural works recorded by Revelation, with falsehood and imposture. *Likelihood*, in this case, becomes the strongest ground of unbelief; and *probability*, though it may convince the understanding, has but little influence over the imagination.

"A sceptic who yields to the powerful proofs of Revelation, will, for a long time, experience a most painful discordance between his judgment and the associations which unbelief has produced. When most earnest in the contemplation of Christian truth, when endeavoring to bring home its comforts to the heart, the imagination will suddenly revolt and cast the whole, at a sweep, among the rejected notions. This is, indeed, a natural consequence of infidelity, which mere reasoning is not able to remove."

Paley meets this difficulty in his *Preparatory Considerations*; yet I think he is here somewhat perplexed, not wielding his pen, as his mind and his subject would allow. I am aware of the heavy clog which impeded his progress, and which has been so great an annoyance to several other eminent Protestant writers. They saw the force of their principles, but they feared the great range of their extent, and they endeavored to confine them arbitrarily within the bounds which would suit their own convenience, and to prevent their progress to conclusions which they did not desire to admit. For instance they wished to estab-

[8] *Likely* is from *simile vero, like the truth.* Rendering of *invraisemblable* by *improbable* is incorrect. Want of *vraisemblance* means *unlike* to usual course of events.

lish Christianity by their aid, but they desired not to establish Catholicism, and if they gave the full force of the principle, it would go to the establishment of the truth of the one, as well as the other. Paley says of Hume,

"Mr. Hume states the cause of miracles to be a contest of opposite improbabilities, that is to say, a question whether it be more improbable that the miracle should be true, or the testimony false: and this I think a fair account of the controversy."

After a variety of observations the archdeacon gives the following answer:

"But the short consideration which, independently of every other, convinces me that there is no solid foundation in Mr. Hume's conclusion, is the following:—When a theorem is proposed to a mathematician, the first thing he does with it is to try it upon a simple case, and if it produce a false result, he is sure that there must be some mistake in the demonstration. Now to proceed in this way with what may be called Mr. Hume's theorem. If twelve men, whose probity and good sense I had long known, should seriously and circumstantially relate to me an account of a miracle wrought before their eyes, and in which it was impossible that they should be deceived: if the governor of the country hearing a rumor of this account, should call these men into his presence, and offer them a short proposal, either to confess the imposture, or submit to be tied up to a gibbet, if they should refuse with one voice to acknowledge that there existed any falsehood or imposture in the case; if this threat was communicated to them separately, yet with no different effect; if it was at last executed; if I myself saw them, one after another, consenting to be racked, burnt, or strangled, rather than give up the truth of their account;—still if Mr. Hume's rule be my guide, I am not to believe them. Now I undertake to say that there exists not a sceptic in the world who would not believe them, or who would defend such incredulity.

"Instances of spurious miracles supported by strong apparent testimony, undoubtedly demand examination; Mr. Hume has endeavored to fortify his argument by some examples of this kind. I hope in a proper place to show that none of them reach the strength or circumstances of the Christian evidence. In these, however, consists the weight of his objection: in the principle itself, I am persuaded that there is none."

In this case Dr. Paley requires the witness of the fact to suffer death before he will believe the truth of the fact; because the circumstance will be found in the case of the Apostles and first martyrs who

testified for the miracles of the Saviour. Their submitting to death proves one of two things; either that they were firmly convinced of the truth of the fact which they testified, and were witnesses of extreme probity; or else that they were most hardened and incorrigible impostors. So that, in truth, the bare submission to death by the witnesses, is not the criterion of the correctness of their testimony. We must from other considerations be satisfied of the existence of the two essential qualifications of evidence by testimony; first, "that the witnesses could not have been, themselves, deceived;" secondly, "that they could not deceive us; or if they made the attempt, that they would have been inevitably detected." The putting of the witnesses to death, and their courageous submission to their fate, is no guarantee to us that they had not been deceived; and although this circumstance would add much strength to existing proofs, it is not proof of truth itself. If we were to assert that evidence of facts could not be had without the death of the witness, being the seal of its sufficiency, our stock of knowledge would indeed be small. Paley had his own object in view when he thus circumscribed the limits of evidence for miraculous facts. If Mr. White ever studied his treatises *Of Ethics* and *De Religione*, in Seville, he would have seen that it was in the power of him who made the laws of nature to suspend any one of them, and that ordinary evidence would have been sufficient to prove that he had done so. Mr. White might then have spared his rigmarole of French and English criticisms, and he would have known that the exertion of God's power is more than likely, more than probable, for it is evidently true, and as capable of being proved, as any usual occurrence. For instance, that the resurrection of Lazarus can be as well, and as easily proved as the death of Julius Cæsar; that there exists as fully adequate a cause for the resuscitation, in the power of God, who is the real agent, using what instrument he may think proper, as of the death, in the law which that God established for usual and ordinary cases. Death is of frequent occurrence, resuscitation of rare occurrence, but a fact which has occurred only once is as easily proved as one which is frequently repeated, each repetition being in itself a full and perfect fact, requiring full and sufficient proof. Thus we need not frequency of occurrence, nor the death of the witnesses, to prove the truth of a fact.

Let us come to view how we ascertain the fact of revelation. If there is any special work which is so peculiarly and exclusively that of an individual, as that it can be performed by no other, the fact of the existence of that work establishes the fact of his presence; and if his presence is a testimony by him of his concurrence in declarations then

made, he is responsible for the truth of those declarations. We believe miracles to be works above the power of created beings, and requiring the immediate presence and agency of the Divinity, and given by him as the proof of his commission to the individuals or societies whom he makes witnesses to men of truth revealed by him. The feeling of the miracle being evidence of his presence for this purpose, is so general, and its testimony so fully given by the human race, as well by their spontaneous declaration, as by their whole course of conduct, that it would argue in our Creator himself a total disregard for man's information, if he permitted its existence during so many centuries, and with such inevitable results, unless it were a criterion of truth. The same consequences would necessarily follow from a permission, on the part of God, of a general delusion of mankind, as to the species of works that are miraculous. When the feeling generally existed, and was acted upon most extensively during a long series of ages, that works of a peculiar description were emphatically miracles, and that the performance of those miracles was an undoubted proof of God's presence to uphold the truth of declarations made in his name by the agents or the instruments used in these works: the author of our nature would be chargable with aiding in our delusion, if he did not as he could, and as his perfections would demand, interfere to correct the error.

Our next observations must regard the quantity of testimony which would be required to prove one of those miraculous facts. The assertion has sometimes been made, that more than usually would suffice for establishing an ordinary fact, would be necessary to prove the existence of a miracle. We altogether dissent from this position. The facts in the one case are precisely as obvious to examination as in the other. Strange as the assertion which I am about to make, will probably appear to many who have honored me with their attention; I plainly say, that it will be found upon reflection, that there is far less danger of deceit or mistake in the examination of a miraculous fact, than there is in one of ordinary occurrence. The reason is simple, and I believe natural and evidently sufficient. The mind is less liable to be imposed upon, when its curiosity is greatly excited, and when its jealousy and suspicion are greatly awakened, than when it is prepared to expect and to admit what it is daily, perhaps hourly in the habit of expecting and admitting. Ordinary events excite no curiosity, create no surprise, and there is no difficulty in admitting, that what has frequently occurred, occurs again. The statement of such an occurrence will easily pass. But the state of the mind is widely different, when we eagerly seek to ascertain whether what has never been witnessed by us before, has now come under our

observation, or whether we have not been under some delusion; whether an attempt has not been made to deceive us. We, in such a case, become extremely jealous; we examine with more than ordinary care, and we run less risk of being deceived or mistaken.

No person doubts the power of the Creator, the supreme legislator and preserver of the universe, to suspend any law of nature in the course of its operation, or to select some individual case which he will except from the operation of that law, and during his own pleasure. The question can never be as to this power, as to the possibility of a miraculous interference; but it always must regard the fact, and that fact must be established by testimony, and without the evidence of testimony, no person who was not present can. be required to believe. There does not, and cannot exist, any individual or tribunal, with power to require or command the humblest mortal to believe without evidence.

There is no place in which the rules of evidence are better understood, or more accurately observed, than in our respectable courts of law. Permit me for a moment, to bring your attention to one of those cases which frequently presents itself to the view of our citizens. There stands a citizen charged with the murder of his fellow-man. Long experience, deep study, unsullied purity, calm impartiality, and patience for investigation, from the judicial character; they are found upon the bench. Steady integrity, the power of discrimination, the love of justice, a deep interest in the welfare of the community, and the sanction of a solemn pledge to heaven, are all found in the jury; the public eye is upon them, and the supreme tribunal of public opinion, after an open hearing of the case, is to pronounce upon the judges and jurors themselves. The life or death, the fame or infamy of the accused lies with them, and is in their keeping, at the peril of their feelings, their character, their conscience and their souls. The decision must be made by the evidence arising from testimony, and that the testimony of men, and those men liable to all the weakness, and all the bad passions of humanity. Yet here, in this important case, a solemn decision must be made. That jury must be satisfied, that the person now said to be dead was living, that he is now dead, that the change from life to death was produced by the act of their fellow-citizen now arraigned before them; that this act was done with sufficient deliberation to proceed from malacious intent; that for this act he had no authority; he who was deprived of life being a peaceable person under the protection of the State. In this there is frequently much perplexity, and little testimony, and that testimony frequently regarding not the substantial ingredients of the crime, but establishing facts from which those that form the ingredients are only

derived by inference. Still we find convictions and executions, and the jury with the approbation of the bench, and the assent of the community, unhesitatingly put on solemn record their conviction of the truth of facts which they never saw, and of which they have only the testimony of their fellow-men; and upon this testimony society agrees that property, liberty, life and fame shall all be disposed of, with perfect assurance of truth and justice.

I will now suppose that court constituted as I have described, and for the purpose of ascertaining the fact of murder. A number of respectable witnesses depose to the fact of the person stated to have been slain, having been alive, they were in habits of intimacy with him, were his companions during years, some of them have seen his dead body, in presence of others who also testify to their having seen and examined that body, those last were present when the prisoner with perfect deliberation inflicted a wound upon the deceased. There can be no doubt as to the identity of the prisoner. A number of physicians testify their opinions as to the wound so given, and which they examined, being a sufficient cause of death. The accused produces no authority for his act; there has been no process of law against the deceased, who was a peaceable and well conducted citizen. How could that jury hesitate? They must, painful as is the task, they must consign the unfortunate culprit to the just vengeance of the law—the judge must deliver him to the executioner, and the public record of the State must exhibit his infamy. Life and character must both disappear, they are swept away by the irresistible force of evidence, founded upon human testimony. The widow must hang her head in shame; in the recess of her dwelling she must sit in lonely, disconsolate, unsupported grief; the orphans blush to bear their father's name; the brothers would forget their kindred: and perhaps even gray hairs would gladly bow still lower, and compelled by grief and years, court the concealment of the grave.

Yet, still, when fact becomes evident from the examination of testimony, we must yield our assent to that fact without regarding its consequences.

Let me continue my supposition. Before the dissolution of that court—whilst it is yet in session, that jury still occupying their seats—a rush is made into the hall—the same identical witnesses appear again; but they are accompanied by the deceased—now raised to life. They testify, that as they were departing from the court, a man, whom they produce, proclaimed that he was commissioned by the Most High to deliver his great behests to his fellow-men; and that to prove the validity of his commission, he summoned them to accompany him to the tomb

of that man whose death they had so fully proved, and that by an appeal to heaven for the authenticity of his commission, that man should revive. They went—they saw the body in the grave—the claimant upon heaven called upon the eternal God to show that he had sent him to teach his fellow-men—he calls the deceased—the body rises—the dead has come to life—he accompanies them to the court—he is recognized by his acquaintances—confessed by his friends—felt by the people—he speaks, he breaths—he moves, he eats, he drinks, he lives amongst them. Can that court refuse to say that it is satisfied of the fact of the resuscitation? What would any honest man think of the members of that jury, should they swear that this man had not been resuscitated by the interference of that individual who thus proves his commission? If that jury could, upon the testimony of those witnesses, find the first fact, why shall they not upon the same testimony find the second?

But we may be asked how we know that this man was dead? Probably it was only a mistake. He could not have been totally bereft of life. Ask the jury, who, upon the certainty of the fact of death, consigned their fellow-citizen to infamy and to the gallows. Shall we admit the certainty for the purpose of human justice, and quibble with our convictions to exclude the testimony of heaven? This, indeed, would be a miserable sophistry. Would any court upon such a plea, so unsupported, issue a respite from execution? An isolated perhaps with nothing to rest upon, set up against positive testimony, resting upon the uncontradicted evidence derived from the senses, from experience, and from analogy. A speculative possibility against a substantive fact, by which fact the very possibility is destroyed.

Where is the cause of doubt? Where the difference between the two cases? In both suppositions the essential facts are the same,—life, death,—identity; the difference consists in the accidental circumstance of the priority of one to the other. The one is the ordinary transition from life to death, an occurrence which is to us most mysterious and inexplicable, but with the existence of which we are long familiar; the other a transition from death to life, not more mysterious but which rarely occurs, and when it does occur, is most closely examined, viewed with jealous scrutiny, and excites deep interest; and to admit the truth of which, there is no pre-disposition in the mind. The facts are precisely the same in the case of the murder and of the miracle: the accident of the priority of each alternately to the other, constitutes the whole difference. And surely if witnesses can tell me that a man who has never died shews all the symptoms of life, the same witnesses can tell me the same fact, though that man had passed from death to life.

The symptoms of life are always the same, and the testimony which will establish the fact of life at one time, by proving the existence of those symptoms, will be at any time sufficient for the same purpose. The same is to be said of the symptoms of death, and of the testimony which will establish the fact by proving their existence. It may be objected that no adequate cause is assigned for this extraordinary occurrence. The answer is two-fold. To be convinced of the truth of a fact, it is not necessary that I should know the cause of its existence, it suffices for me to know the existence of the fact itself: and its existence will not be the less certain, though I should never be able to discover the cause. How many facts do we every day witness, whose causes are still to us inaccessible and undiscovered. Next—an adequate cause is here distinctly pointed out and referred to. He who first breathed into the nostrils of man, whom he fashioned from the dust, a living soul, is now equally powerful to call back the departed spirit to its mouldering tenement of clay.

Viewed in this way, which is the fair and proper mode of considering the subject, the whole difficulty vanishes: because it is as easy for God to produce an effect by the immediate intervention of his power, as through the mediation of the laws which he has established to regulate the ordinary course of events. The facts in the one case are as obvious, and as easily examined as in the other case: the truth of the facts being established, and their miraculous nature being evident; all the jargon which White wrote might be dispensed with, and all the quibbles of Hume are puerile. The broad evident fact stares us in the face; but there is a race of weak and superficial beings, who always seek to evade the admission of a principle or of a fact which might possibly interfere with their wishes, and those persons most unreasonably deny reason itself, when it stands in their way, and seek for any asylum in the untintelligible world of delusive sounds, such as the specimen which I have selected from White.

I remain, yours, B. C.

LETTER XII.

Charleston, S. C., Nov. 20, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends—I now proceed to examine the assertions of Mr. White, as to his motives for becoming a Protestant of the English Church. Hitherto, I have confined myself to showing that, if he took up Paley's principle, and the facts which White must have known to be true, he

must necessarily have become a Roman Catholic; and, farther, that Paley himself could not by his own principles escape the conclusion, that Catholicism is the revelation of God, except by denying what White knew to be true, and by asserting that which White must have known to be false; and, besides, that by attempting to avoid these conclusions, White and most Protestant writers become so confusedly bewildered, in treating of the doctrine of miracles, that they are scarcely intelligible upon this momentous subject. Let us now hear Mr. White's reasons, as given before, in the passage quoted in my seventh letter.

He tells us that, after having read Paley, he prayed regularly for divine aid, because "nothing but humble prayer can indeed obtain that faith, which, when reason and judgment have lead us to supernatural truth, gives to unseen things the body and substance of reality," page 29. It is a little extraordinary that the old objection which he mentions in *Doblado's Letters*, page 297, should not have again risen to his mind. There he judged that because one absurdity, as he called the doctrine of hell, presented itself, it would be folly to pray; and instead of praying, and reading works in favor of revelation, he neglected his prayers, because they were a burthen, and were unmeaning, and he read with avidity every work against revelation. Indeed, his prayer was no great task; for, instead of two hours which the Roman Catholic Church required, the Lord's prayer, which might be dispatched in two minutes, sufficed. If, then, faith could be had at so easy a rate, for so short a prayer, he must have been grossly negligent of the great duty of prayer in Spain, when he lost faith through neglect. Yet this neglect was not enjoined by his Church, so that he is to attribute the loss of belief to his disobeying the lay of that Romish Church which enjoined the duty of prayer.

How convenient is it to take up occasionally the semblance of virtue, when it serves our purpose, and to sneer at the reality of virtue in others? This romance,—for I will now call it what I have shown it to be,—exhibits White as being unable to attain faith without prayer, even after he had been convinced by argument; that a reply might be afforded to the persons who say that they cannot be Christians, though they cannot argue against Christianity; but let a Catholic assert, that you should pray to God to aid you by giving you faith, how quickly should we be assailed with every epithet which supercilious arrogance could bestow? Ignorance, folly, priestcraft, hood-winking, stupidity, and such expressions would embroider the body of the sentences, which would be exhibited to an admiring public.

Let us remember, then, that Mr. White acknowledged faith to be

a gift of God, for the obtaining of which it is necessary to pray. This will yet stand us in some stead. He continued this practice of repeating the Lord's prayer, once every morning, during three years; his persuasion, that Christianity "was not one and the same thing with the Roman Catholic religion, growing stronger all the while," page 30. Will Mr. White expect us to believe that each succeeding prayer obtained for him new light? This new light must have exhibited truth better to his mind. If Paley's argument was good, and led to truth, White fell into error; because Paley's book, as soon as its falsehoods are struck out, fully establishes the conclusion, that Christianity and the Roman Catholic religion are one and the same thing. To what, then, are we to attribute Mr. White's assertion? My own impression is, that his statement of the fact is untrue.

This is a very strong assertion, but I shall endeavor to maintain its correctness. My opinion is, that this man did not believe in the truth of Christianity, or if he did, that he must have known the truth of the Roman Catholic Church; my opinion is, that he was not then a Christian. My first reason for this opinion is, that Mr. White is an unsafe and insufficient witness, and we have only his authority for the statement. My second reason is, that the fact is most improbable; and I cannot be asked to believe an improbability, without positive evidence sufficient to establish the fact, and here I have none. My third reason is, that I find, as I shall show hereafter, from several passages of White's production, that it is impossible he could have been what he professed to be.

He next tells us, "that his rejection of revealed religion had been the effect not of direct objection to its evidences, but of weighing tenets against them, which they were not intended to support," page 30. Yet he told us in page 21, that his doubts did not affect any particular doctrine, "but his first doubts attacked the very basis of Catholicism." One of those assertions must be untrue. It is not for me to decide which is the falsehood. But it is for me to say, that it is now manifest, that this witness is entitled to no credit.

He proceeds to inform us, "the balance inclined in favor of the truth of the Gospel in proportion as he struck out dogmas which he had been taught to identify with the doctrine of Christ." He does not inform us what those doctrines were; but in *Doblado's Letters*, as I showed before, he stated the first which he found to be at variance with the goodness of God, and which being a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, he had been taught to identify with the doctrines of Christ, was that of the existence of hell; of course we must presume that he struck out this, as it was the absurdity which caused his rejection of Christianity.

If, then, he struck this out, he certainly was not approximating to Christianity. Thus it is very improbable that he became a Christian.

To this paragraph, he appends the following note, page 30:

"Paley, with his usual penetration, has pointed out this most important result of the Reformation: 'When the doctrine of Transubstantiation (he says in his address to Dr. Law, Bishop of Carlisle, prefixed to the *Principles of Moral Philosophy*) had taken possession of the Christian world, it was not without the industry of learned men that it came at length to be discovered, that no such doctrine was contained in the New Testament. But had those excellent persons done nothing more by their discovery than abolish an innocent superstition, or change some directions in the ceremonial of public worship, they had merited little of that veneration with which the gratitude of Protestant Churches remembers their services. What they did for mankind was this—"They exonerated Christianity of a weight that sunk it.' "

Respecting the note, I shall at present briefly remark, that transubstantiation was in possession of the Christian world, during all the ages which had elapsed from the establishment of Christianity to the period when this industry was so applied; and the opinion which was the result of the industry, was set up to destroy the fact, which was upheld by every species of testimonial evidence. Some persons thought this doctrine a load, which sunk Christianity, and caused several to reject the system, because of this tenet, which they would not believe. The Reformers, as they call themselves, took off the load. Did they thereby increase the number of the faithful? The remark is worth just as much as the similar one used by the Rev. Mr. Whitaker, in a sermon preached in this city, not long since, which is substantially: "That the doctrine of the Trinity was a load which sunk Christianity; and the requisition of belief in this absurdity, which industrious scholars found not to be contained in the New Testament, prevented thousands from embracing Christianity; but the Unitarians exonerated Christianity of a weight that sunk it." Another time, and I shall take up the doctrine in another manner; at present, its value may be estimated by comparison.

A little afterwards, Mr. White says, page 31: "The points of difference between the Church of England and Rome, though important, are comparatively few; they were besides the very points which had produced his general belief." Really, I was of a different opinion; for, until I have been thus instructed by the Rev. Joseph Blanco White, a Clergyman of the Church of England, I was under the full impression that the Church of England taught the existence of hell. Mr. White imforms us, in *Doblado's Letters*, that this doctrine was the first which

produced his general unbelief. I knew that the American Protestant Episcopal Church was somewhat delicate upon this doctrine, for the clergymen were, and for aught I know still are, at liberty to put or not to put into the Apostles' Creed, the phrase, "he descended into hell;" but I never suspected the Church of England upon this topic, until I read Mr. White's statement. This doctrine, Doblado says, drove him from the Catholic Church; and White tells us, page 31, "When approaching the Church of England, both the absence of what drove me from Catholicism, and the existence of the other parts of the system, made me feel as if I were returning to the repaired home of my youth."

But the most extraordinary passage in the entire of Mr. White's book, is that in which he in page 30, states, that "the day arrived, when convinced of the substantial truth of Christianity, no question remained before him but that of choosing the form under which he was to profess it." To our American friends, who have been so long in the habit of taking their peculiar views of the subject, this will appear the most natural state of mind. But in such a man as White, it is a state which does not correspond with nature. I must be a little more tedious than I would wish upon this topic.

In order to understand properly the case which we examine, we must again stop to inquire what Christianity is. It is the religion established by Christ. Religion consists in the belief of certain doctrines whose truth has been revealed by God, and in the discharge of certain duties prescribed by him; the belief is called faith; the practice of duties consists in fulfilling moral obligations, and performing ritual service, or being engaged therein. Thus the Christian religion consists in believing the doctrines taught by Christ, fulfilling the moral precepts of his law, and being properly engaged in the ritual service which he established.

A code of doctrine is some collection of known and ascertained dogmas or tenets, specially given, and which is comprised in a written or printed book, and it cannot be of any practical utility unless it is so plain as to be fully and easily intelligible, or unless some known and authorized tribunal shall be established to give its precise meaning upon all necessary points and occasions.

It is like the statutes of a nation, which however plainly they may be written, and however perspicuously they may be constructed, and however judiciously they may be compiled, still are liable to be mistaken; and hence every nation constitutes a judicial tribunal, to give their precise meaning in all cases of doubt: so for the purpose of ascertaining the principles of morality in the Christian law, and their ap-

plication to special cases, a tribunal is as necessary as it is to ascertain the principles of law, and to apply the provisions to special cases: and rites must be ascertained and regulated in like manner. If no such tribunal existed, every man would hold his own opinion respecting doctrine, and we would behold those opinions perpetually in contradiction to each other. If Christ gave the doctrine of God, he gave a doctrine which was true, uniform, consistent with itself, and not a mass of contradictions. I cannot therefore call all those contradictions truth. Thus a man cannot say he is convinced of the truth of Christianity until he knows what Christianity is, and he cannot know what Christianity is, before he knows either what are the doctrines which Christ taught, or what is the tribunal from which he will receive them: he must also know the moral law of Christ, or the tribunal from which he can learn it, and the ritual institutions of Christ, or the tribunal from which he will learn them; or else he cannot be convinced of the substantial truth of Christianity. If Mr. White knew the tribunal, his examination as to the form under which he should profess Christianity must have been closed; because he knew the form established by that tribunal. If he knew the doctrine, and the moral and ritual disipline, his examination must also have been closed; for he knew the form when he knew those parts which composed it.

Let us however try if we can find Mr. White's meaning. Suppose he meant to say that he was convinced Christ has established a religion of truth, which all men ought to profess: that seeing so many sects contradicting each other, he knew they could not be all teaching the true doctrine of the Saviour, and he therefore was at a loss to know which he ought to embrace. If he calls this being convinced of the substantial truth of Christianity, he certainly has made an extraordinary assertion when he states: "No question remained before him but that of choosing the form under which he was to profess it. The deliberation which preceded this choice was one of no great difficulty to him." You will agree with me, unless he found some authorized tribunal to aid in fixing his knowledge of the doctrines and the institutions of the Saviour, there lay before him a task sufficient to occupy nearly his whole life; because he should leave no one of those forms or sects unexamined, lest that which he omitted might be the very one which he should choose: next he ought himself to know accurately all the doctrines and institutions of the Saviour, that he might be able to discover which sect held those doctrines, and which deviated from them. If he had this accurate knowledge, his labor indeed would have been at an end. It is plain therefore, that there are only three modes, for discovering the doctrines of Christ: first, to

find some infallible witness which shall tell us with certainty which they are; this is our mode, and was rejected by Mr. White, who left our communion; the second is by inspiration; to this mode Mr. White lays no claim; the third is by learning the doctrines in detail from an extensive and laborious investigation. Mr. White says of the English Church and the Roman Catholic, "that the doctrines common to both Churches were found in the Scriptures, his early studies and professional knowledge left him no room to doubt." It is very strange that there is scarcely one true proposition of three in his doctrinal assertions, and still more strange, that he contradicts almost one-third of his own doctrinal statements. It is by no means true, that all the doctrines contained in the English Protestant creed are found in the Scriptures; many of those which the Church of England holds in common with us are known only from tradition; I might easily sum up several, I shall mention two or three of the first which strike me, viz. the validity of infant baptism, the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin, the validity of baptism conferred by lay-persons, or by infidels, the validity of orders conferred by heretics, and a vast number of others. Again, both Churches believe in the existence of hell or a place of eternal punishment. Mr. White wrote *Doblado's Letters* after the period of his becoming a member of the Protestant Church—both Churches state that they find this doctrine in the Scriptures, and White rejects it.

"Suppose, however, the reality and magnitude of the recompense—am I not daily in danger of eternal perdition? My heart sinks within me at the view of the interminable list of offenses, every one of which may finally plunge me into everlasting flames. Everlasting! and why so? Can there be revenge or cruelty in the Almighty?"

Against this he struggled, this he called absurdity, and as the Catholic Church had a faith which was invisible, whatever proved it all, proved absurdity;—therefore he left Catholic faith, because of the doctrine of health; page 297, *Doblado's Letters.* Yet he tells us, *Evidence,* page 30:

"The deliberation which preceded this choice was one of no great difficulty to me. The points of difference between the Church of England and Rome, though important, are comparatively few: they were, besides, the very points which had produced my general unbelief. That the common doctrines to both Churches were found in the Scriptures, my early studies and professional knowledge, left me no room to doubt; and as the evidences of Revelation had brought me to acknowledge the authority of the Scriptures, I could find no objection to the resumption of tenets which had so long possessed my belief. The communion in

which I was inclined to procure admission was not, indeed, that in which I was educated; but I had so long wandered away from the Roman fold, that, when approaching the Church of England, both the absence of what had driven me from Catholicism, and the existence of all the other parts of that system, made me feel as if I were returning to the repaired home of my youth."

My friends, why would not the variegated host of Doctors, from Bishop Kemp to the most humble of those who follow in his train, members as well of the Church which he deserted as of that into which he climbed, vouchsafe to tell us whether they believe in the existence of a place of eternal punismment? What say they to Mr. White upon this subject, or will the Doctors hold a consultation upon his contradictions? Indeed, his disease in this regard has already assumed a desperate character, and yet all the symptoms have not been developed.

What will they say to the passages in the very next page to that in which he informs us with such pathos of his return to a Church so like his own, "the repaired home of his youth." For he tells us in page 31, that he had no "secret leaning" to the Church that he had left, "for Catholicism was blended with his bitterest recollections." This to me appears more like the thoughtless rhapsody of some fanciful laureate elated by the influence of his pipe of port, than like the sober statement of an humble convert declaring before God and man the plain facts of an interesting occurrence. Did the associated Doctors calmly read this tissue of contradiction, before they gave their names to the scrutiny of a patient, investigating and intelligent people? Did they before God in singleness of soul believe that Mr. White's book was an honest relation of truth, given by a religious man? If they did, I could not respect their powers of criticism, or their information. If they did not, what am I to say? Shall I believe that their prejudice against our religion urged them to assail us even with such a compilation. I regret their act, not for any injury to our Church, because, it has done us service; but I regret that our country affords such an exhibition. I shall continue.

I remain yours, B. C.

LETTER XIII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 27, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—We have now brought Mr. White, through a series of improbablities and contradictions, to be a good Protestant of the

Church of England; whose doctrines he subscribed in the year 1814, having been led thereto by Paley and by prayer. He then after a period of a year and a half resumed his priestly character, which by the bye he had never thrown off, though he had frequently disgraced it. The Church of England as well as the Catholic Church teaches the inamissibility of this character, which is another doctrine not found in the New Testament, in which they agree. I shall only remark that White as a convert, was by the English law required to swear a few oaths, besides subscribing the articles, and I shall on future occasions, have to advert to this, for the purpose of shewing that his own works shew him, even at the date of last year, to hold tenets incompatible with this oath and with those articles.

He next informs us that at Oxford he spent two years as tutor to the son of a nobleman. This was after he had "returned to the repaired home of his youth," subsequently to his "deliberation, which was not one of great difficulty to him," for the purpose "of choosing the form under which he was to profess that Christianity of whose substantial truth he was convinced," after he had "no room to doubt" of the truth of the doctrines of the Church of England, the truth of which he had solemnly subscribed to and confirmed with his oath. All inquiry we must suppose was now at an end, the religion he had embraced he had no doubt was that which Christ revealed, and which was contained in the laws of the Gospel, and to observe which he made "a solemn engagement by receiving the sacrament" in that Church, [after which,] "to complete such acknowledgment he resumed his priestly character." This man has therefore now rest in his faith, he has the undoubted conviction that all that to which he has pledged his signature, his oath, the sacrament, and his priestly character, is true. Alas! my friends, we now begin to find the correct manifestation of what all this is worth! How valueless are all those pledges and professions! ! Mr. White as yet has not faith! As yet he knows not what has been revealed! ! ! So he informs us himself in pages 33 of his *Evidence.*

"Neither the duties of the tutorship, nor the continual sufferings which I have endured ever since, could damp my eagerness in search of religious truth. Shall I be suspected of cant in this declaration? Alas! let the confession which I am going to make, be the unquestionable, though melancholy proof of my sincerity.

"For more than three years my studies in divinity were to me a source of increasing attachment to Christian faith and practice. When I quitted my charge as tutor, I had begun a series of short lectures on religion, the first part of which I delivered to the young members of the

family. Having retired to private lodgings in London, it was my intention to prosecute that work for the benefit of the young persons; but there was by this time a mental phenomenon ready to appear in me, to which I cannot now look back without a strong sense of my own weakness. My vehement desire of knowledge not allowing me to neglect any opportunity of reading whatever books on divinity came to my hands, I studied the small book on *The Atonement*, by Taylor of Norwich. The confirmed habits of my mind were too much in accordance with everything that promised to remove mystery from Christianity, and I adopted Taylor's views without in the least suspecting the consequences. It was not long, however, before I found myself beset with great doubts on the divinity of Christ. My state now became exceedingly painful; for, though greatly wanting religious comfort in the solitude of a sick room, I was a prey to pain and extreme weakness, I perceived that religious practices had lost their power of soothing me. But no danger or suffering has, in the course of my life, deterred me from the pursuit of truth. Having now suspected that it might be found in the Unitarian system, I boldly set out upon the search; but there I did not find it. Whatever industry and attention could do, all was performed with candor and earnestness; but, in length of time, Christianity, in the light of Unitarianism, appeared to me a mighty work to little purpose; and I lost all hope of quieting my mind. With doubts unsatisfied wherever I turned, I found myself rapidly sliding into the gulf of scepticism; but it pleased God to prevent my complete relapse. I knew too well the map of infidelity to be deluded a second time by the hope of finding a resting place to the sole of my foot, throughout its wide domains; and now I took and kept a determination to give my mind some rest, from the studies, which, owing to my peculiar circumstances had evidently occasioned the moral fever under which I labored. What was the real state of my faith in this period of darkness, God alone can judge. This only can I state with confidence,—that I prayed daily for light; that I invariably considered myself bound to obey the precepts of the Gospel; and that, when harassed with fresh doubts, and tempted to turn away from Christ, I often repeated from my heart the affecting exclamation of the Apostle Peter—"to whom shall I go? thou hast the words of eternal life."

After reading this extract I would ask whether this good man had not as much reason for leaving the Protestant church of England as he had for leaving the Catholic Church in Spain. And, whether, if in this state of mind he had selected profligate infidels for his companions, read the works of philosophists against revelation, indulged in gross immoral habits, in a word acted in England as he acted in Spain, the result would

not have been similar? Therefore upon his own shewing, it was not the superiority of evidence, the preponderance of argument in favor of Protestantism over Catholicism, which kept him now in the new church, nor was it that faith which is founded upon the conviction of unerring truth, when the special truth has been clearly proved; but he avoids infidelity, because he had experienced its folly, and he remains a Protestant, not upon a Protestant principle, but upon a Catholic principle; not because he discovers the special truth of the particular doctrine, but because he must adhere to the declarations of Christ: and to me it is most extraordinary how he can know what is the meaning of those declarations, unless he takes it from the authority of the Church, for he does not take it upon his own private judgment, since he informs us that he was unable to form any judgment or decision as to what Christ taught: doubt, and the moral fever, not conviction of truth, having been the result of his studies, and hence he rests from his studies without coming to any decision, and therefore if he believes, it must be upon authority, and not upon private judgment.

"For some time I thought it an act of criminal insincerity to approach, with these doubts, the sacramental table; but the consciousness that it was not in my power to alter my state of mind, and that, if death, as it appeared very probable, should overtake me as I was, I could only throw myself with all my doubts upon the mercy of my Maker, induced me to do the same in the performance of the most solemn act of religion."

This is the man who in Spain daily approached the sacramental table, not only with doubts, but with absolute infidelity, and this during his ten years of hypocrisy!—Let his own words be his own condemnation.

I shall not dwell now upon this most extraordinary but by no means uncommon assertion "that it was not in his power to alter his state of mind." Never was there a more groundless, a more dangerous, or a more irreligious proposition. But I am not now examining his doctrine, but his history. How quickly he overcame his scruples; and without faith he does that for which faith is required, and pledges a virtue which he does not possess. As yet then Mr. White is not a believer. But now his conversion is to be affected.

"But I had not often to undergo this awful trial. Objections which, during this struggle, had appeared to me unanswerable, began gradually to lose their weight on my mind. The *Christian Evidences* which, at the period of my change from infidelity, struck me as powerful in detail, now presenting themselves collectively, acquired a strength which no detached difficulties (and all the arguments of infidelity are so,) could

shake. My mind, in fact, found rest in that kind of conviction which belongs peculiarly to moral subjects, and seems to depend on an intuitive perception of the truth through broken clouds of doubt, which it is not in the power of mortal man completely to dispel. Let no one suppose that I allude to either mysterious or enthusiastic feelings; I speak of conviction arising from examination. But any man, accustomed to observe the workings of the mind, will agree, that conviction, in intricate moral questions, comes finally in the shape of internal feelings—a perception perfectly distinct from syllogistic conviction, but which asserts the strongest power over our moral nature. Such perception of the truth is, indeed, the spring of our most important actions, the common bond of social life, the ground of retributive justice, the parent of all human laws. Yet, it is inseparable from more or less doubt; for doubtless conviction is only to be found about objects of sense, or those abstract creations of the mind, pure number and dimension, which employ the ingenuity of mathematicians. That assurance respecting things not seen, which the Scriptures call Faith, is a supernatural gift, which reasoning can never produce. This difference between the conviction resulting from the examination of the *Christian Evidences*, and faith, in the scriptural sense of the word, appears to me of vital importance, and much to be attended to by such as, having renounced the Gospel, are yet disposed to give a candid hearing to its advocates. The power of the *Christian Evidences*, is that of leading any considerate mind, unobstructed by prejudice, to the records of revelation, and making it ready to derive instruction from that source of supernatural truth; but it is the spirit of truth alone that can impart the internal conviction of faith."

Mark then finally what he describes his faith to be, a belief of truth accompanied with clouds of doubt, which it is not in man's power to dispel; conviction of truth, perception of truth, yet not conviction, and not perception, because accompanied with more or less doubt. Assurance of truth given by God, because supernatural, and yet not as strong an assurance of truth as we have from the objects that fall under the cognizance of our senses. An internal conviction of faith, coming from the Spirit of truth, and yet inseparable from more or less doubt. My friends, is this contradictory jargon intelligible? Yet such is Mr. White's faith!! Was I wrong then when I asserted that as yet he had no faith. We call faith "a firm belief of all that God reveals." The objects of sense may and do frequently delude and deceive, but God cannot deceive. Error is frequently detected in the operations of the mind respecting pure number and dimension, mathematicians have fre-

quently erred and misled. But who shall say that God might be deceived? Who shall say that God can deceive us when he reveals knowledge, and requires our belief? The heavens and the earth may pass away, but his word cannot fail.

Will Bishop Kemp call this blasphemy of White a description of faith? Will this pack of Doctors avow that the certainty of what the Scriptures contain is more liable to doubt than is the investigation of the philosopher? I have frequently discovered that respectable gentlemen and good scholars of other Churches, with whom I conversed, had not the most remote idea of the nature of faith. But this is the first time in my life that I find a congregated assembly of Protestant assailants of Catholicism, with a convert bishop at their head, avow by implication that they are not as certain of the truth of the doctrines which they preach, which the Spirit of truth reveals, and imparts, and which the Bible contains, as they are of the truth what falls under the observation of their senses. Yet these gentlemen are well paid for preaching as truth what they only perceive through broken clouds of doubt, which it is not in the power of mortal man completely to dispel! The truths of the Bible, they say are surrounded by such doubts, the Catholic says they are not; and yet these gentlemen assail the Catholic for not making the Bible the standard of his belief! ! ! Will Bishop Kemp adhere to White and give up the Bible: or adhere to the Bible, and confess that he did wrong in recommending this unbeliever as an orthodox son of the Protestant Church? If Bishop Kemp has not so much affection for his beloved Zion, even I shall protect her against the sceptic renegade. The Church of England teaches that the truth of the Scriptures is infallibly established. White does not give the doctrine of the Church of England, though he pledged his oath to give it.

Having thus, as he states, " gone through the religious history of his mind," he adds that under that "mental despotism which would prevent investigation by the fear of eternal ruin, or which mocks reason by granting the examination of the premises while it reserves to itself the right of drawing conclusions; he was irresistibly urged into a denial of revelation." If, as it would appear, he means this as a description of the system of our Church, his first assertion is a gross mistatement; so far from preventing, we invite investigation; we dread the careless, the heedless, the persons who only glance and rapidly hasten to undue conclusions, because they have not investigated; but we have no dread of him who calmly and closely searches with a sincere love for truth. White himself finds his first position to be untenable, and he therefore quickly abandons it, and takes up another, but one, if possible, less fitted

for his purpose: he admits that we invite to a close examination of the premises, but will not allow a right of drawing conclusions except in one way. Did any logician know of opposite conclusions flowing from the same premises? Was there ever such a mockery of reason as to assert that contradictions can flow from the same source of reason? Is it because the Catholic Church applies in the important concern of religion the great principle of right reason, of good sense, and of correct logic, that she is to be accused of mocking reason? Could this sentence have been indited by a man of common information? Does Bishop Kemp approve of this? Surely the only rational mode of testing an argument of religion is by investigation of the premises: there can be no liberty, no choice as to the conclusion.

This extraordinary outrage upon logic is followed by an outrage upon the truth. "But no sooner did I obtain freedom, than instead of my mind running riot in the enjoyment of the long delayed boon, it opened to conviction and acknowledged the truth of Christianity." His mind was free in Spain as it was in England, and he tells us the consequence in *Doblado's Letters.*

But even after his arrival in England, four years elapsed before he is, according to his own account, convinced of the substantial truth of Christianity, and five years after, that is nine years after his arrival in England, and nineteen years after emancipating his mind from despotism of being obliged to draw correct conclusions from examined premises, he is rapidly gliding into the gulf of scepticism, from which he escapes, not by the examination of either premises or conclusions; but by throwing himself, with all his doubts, "upon the mercy of his maker," and by having "a perception perfectly distinct from syllogistic conviction," "an intuitive perception of truth through broken clouds of doubt, which it is not in the power of mortal man to dispel."

Here I close my examination of the character of Mr. White. From his own words, he is illiberal descendant of a persecuted, Irish Catholic family, who, having deserted his religion and his country, calls upon the oppressive government of Great Britain to continue the affliction of the land of his ancestors, since its inhabitants will not, like him, desert the religion of his fathers, and of their choice. He is a man whose youth was spent in crime, whose manhood was a tissue of hypocrisy, infidelity, injustice and profligacy, who asserts gross falsehoods, and piles up innumerable contradictions, upon the most solemn subject; a man who is totally bereft of family affection, having exhibited the weakness of his parents, and betrayed the solemnly confided secrets of his sisters, if his relation be true; a man upon whose word you can place no reliance, upon

whose reasoning you can set no value, and upon whose conscience you can fix no bond; for he has deliberately made, and as deliberately broken, his solemn vows, he has sworn and forsworn; and he has solemnly called God to witness what was legally and morally impossible: such is his account of himself, and if sacrilege can add another tinge to the colors which he has laid on; he committed sacrilege in the profanation of the holy Eucharist daily during ten years in Spain, and went to the sacramental table in the Church of England whilst harrased with doubts, at a "time he thought it an act of criminal insincerity to approach with these doubts to the sacramental table," merely because "he was conscious that it was not in his power to alter the state of his mind."

This is the witness of extraordinary qualifications, whom the Right Rev. Father in God, James Kemp, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland, and the Rev. William Hawley, the Rev. Doctors Wilmer, Tyng, and Co. bring forward to convict nearly two hundred millions of the human family, for so great is the number in our communion, and all their predecessors since the days of the Apostles, amongst whom were and are some of the brightest ornaments and best benefactors of the human race.

I probably have been thought tedious, and may have been looked upon as having strayed from the true question, which was the value of the *Evidence*. But its value must necessarily depend in a great measure upon the character of the witness, and as he was trumpeted forth as above all suspicion, and possessing peculiar facilities and uncommon qualifications, I felt myself called upon to exhibit him such as he really is, from his own words. I have other information, which I have abstained from using, as though I knew the correctness of the facts, I could not adduce the authority. I shall now, in every case where we have only Mr. White's assertion for the truth of the fact, consider it as not worth examination, until some one of his compurgators shall prove him worthy of credit—and my future letters shall contain an examination of his *Evidence*. Yours, B. C.

LETTER XIV

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 4, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—Having disposed of the author, we now come to his work. The *Evidence* of Mr. White consists of three portions, viz. his assertions, the value of which is nothing; his reasoning, which is worth

what may be found to be the result of its examination; and the statements and reasonings of others; the value of which is to be determined also upon their examination. His work is divided into chapters, each of which contains his evidence upon one or more of the doctrines or practices of our Church. His second chapter is the one which I now come to examine. This regards the real and practical extent of the authority of the Pope, according to the Roman Catholic faith. Next, Intolerance, its natural consequences. I now proceed to examine his statements respecting the first portion of this matter.

He first states that, in Catholic countries, the distinction between doctrines of faith which are immutable, and opinions upon which disputes and differences are tolerated is clearly understood; but such a distinction is not understood in England. If he means to insinuate, that the Roman Catholics of the British islands are not as well informed respecting this distinction as are any other portion of their fellow-members in the Church, he has written what is not true. If he means only to state, that Protestants do not generally understand the distinction, I agree with him, and will go farther and assert, that in this country I have scarcely met with a Protestant who had the most remote notion of the distinction. As, perhaps, some such persons may read this letter, I shall exhibit its nature, because it is important. By the principles of the Roman Catholic Church, no person is bound to believe any thing as an article of faith, save what God has revealed. If God has revealed its truth, that truth is immutable; no discovery in science, no progress of knowledge, no improvement in society, can make that which God has revealed cease to be the truth of God; it must continue to be the doctrine of faith; immutable, irreformable, to the end of the world, in every nation of the world. The denial of such truth constitutes the loss of faith, and a separation from the Church. There are several topics in some measure connected with religion, upon which we have no revelation of God, or if he made a revelation, we have no evidence thereof; those topics are frequently discussed; Roman Catholics believe that no power was left to the Church to compel us to adopt any particular opinion upon those topics, if God made no revelatin, because no power but that of God himself can command the submission of the human mind; and if it should so happen, that a doubt existed, as to whether any revelation was made upon such topics, during the inquiry, and until the discovery of the evidence, the Church has no power to command our adoption of one opinion, or our rejection thereof. She is said then to tolerate any such opinion; because, if she does not see that God has revealed what is incompatible with its truth, she cannot

prevent its being held, nor cut off from her communion those persons who may, upon such topic, hold even contradictory opinions. Thus she cannot tolerate any error in faith; but she does and must tolerate difference of opinion where faith is not concerned.

When, therefore, I state that for Catholic faith an agreement with the Church in all her doctrines is required, I do not mean opinions by doctrines, for doctrine is what God has revealed; opinion is but the conjecture of man; doctrine emanates from the Almighty, and is testified by the tribunal of the Church; opinion flows from human reasoning, and can be testified by no tribunal: each individual forms his own, and changes it when and to what extent he pleases. The Church is answerable for all the results of her doctrine, but is not chargeable with either the opinions or the results of the opinions of her members, however elevated or depressed may be their station. The doctrine is known from the testimony of the public tribunal; the opinion is found in the disquisitions of individuals or parties. In our courts of law, the decision of the bench is of value, and is authority; but the private opinion of one of the judges, or the argument of one of the lawyers, or of any number of the members of the bar, is not the decision of the court. By keeping this distinction which White recognizes, with which every Catholic is conversant, but with which few Protestants are acquainted, fully in view, almost all White's argument will be found worse than valueless.

As I am in some measure obliged to follow the order of the work, I am here compelled to make a digression to another topic. White next distinguishes amongst the English Catholics two kinds of writers; one who write for the Protestant public, and for Catholics who cannot digest the real system of the Roman head: "the other who write for the mass of the British and Irish Church, who still adhere to the Roman Catholic system, such as it is professed in countries where all other religions are condemned by law." "In our devotional books, he recognizes every feature of the religion in which he was educated." In those intended for the public at large, he finds only a flattering portrait, almost ideal and disguised to prevent disgust.

Upon this passage I shall not have to dwell for any length of time. I shall merely remark: first, that as regarded what he calls "Catholics who cannot digest the real system," it would be the most drivelling folly to write for them books of one kind with a digestible doctrine, different from that which was indigestible, and which they could purchase in any shop, or take up in any church, or find in any family; which they had in their hands in childhood, were examined upon in their youth, and heard preached from every pulpit during their lives—such an at-

tempt at imposture would defeat itself. What can be thought of the moral feeling, or of the understanding of him who could make such a statement? If White knew the facts he must have seen the books, why does he not give the dissonant passages? Our books of devotion are held on sale by booksellers of every religious denomination: many of the best editions have been given by Protestants. To what straits then must that man be driven who would make such an assertion as the above? In any ordinary case, this flagrant falsehood would speak enough for the condemnation of him who made it. But we have here a most important concession, or rather recognition of a plain fact, viz. "That the religious system of the mass of the British and Irish Catholic Church is such as it is in those countries, where all other religions are condemned by law. Consequently, the same as it is in Spain: for White recognizes every feature of the religion in which he was educated," page 42.

He then introduces Mr. Charles Butler's *Book of the Roman Catholic Church* as a most artful picture of the disguising kind, but without making the comparison which would have sustained his assertion if true. I regret much never having had an opportunity of seeing this work, and the more so, as on the present occasion it causes me to write under considerable disadvantage. He charges Mr. Butler with having made a mistake in translating a Latin passage—but which mistake has no concern that I can see with any doctrine—and therefore I shall grant the victor the full benefit of his plume. At all events it would tend to show that ignorant as were the monks at Seville, they knew how to teach Latin, and that all their pains were not lost upon their precocious pupil. Having now triumphantly fixed this feather in his cap, he comes flushed with conquest to inform the British Catholics that Mr. Butler has given an incorrect view of their most essential duties as Catholics. We must recollect that this is the same Mr. White who paid no attention to the dull lectures of divinity at Seville, and who took out his degree at Osuna, for which no examination or interval was required. This same gentleman now bloated into knowledge, and swelled to as great a size as Dr. Kemp could desire, pays "attention to some remarks on that part of Butler's book which treats of the authority of the Pope."—Of course it cannot be expected that I should be able to shew how his remarks have or have not any bearing upon a book which I have not seen: but I shall take up the remarks upon their own merits. Let us now examine them.

"*The Book of the Roman Catholic Church* labors to persuade the world that the authority of the Pope over the Catholics is of so spiritual

a nature, as, if strictly reduced to what the creed of that Church requires, can never interfere with the civil duties of those who own that authority. That the supreme head of the Catholics has for a long series of centuries, actually claimed a paramount obedience, and thus actually interfered with the civil allegiance of his spiritual subjects; is as notorious as the existence of the Roman See. The question then, is, whether this was a mere abuse, the effect of human passions encouraged by the ignorance of those ages, or a fair consequence of doctrines held by the Roman Church as of divine origin, and consequently immutable. I will proceed in this inquiry upon Mr. Butler's own statement of Roman Catholic articles of faith, which is found page 118 of the first edition of his work."

Not so fast however, for I must exhibit White's own faults as I proceed. In this extract we have at least two. Every Roman Catholic in America will join Mr. Butler in declaring that the Pope's authority is merely of a spiritual nature and can never interfere with the temporal authority of our government. White asserts that during centuries the Pope has claimed a paramount obedience and thus interfered with the civil allegiance of his spiritual subjects. The fallacy of every dishonest writer is founded upon vagueness. Here are two vague expressions, "a long series of centuries" and "his spiritual subjects." We saw before that the Catholic faith is always the same, and is the same for all persons. To be the foundation of a good argument those two vague expressions should as logicians would say, be taken universally, that is to embrace every age and every spiritual subject of the Pope. But in fact the first "long series of centuries" embraces only a period of special regulation which commenced very many centuries after the establishment of the Church, and of the Popedom, and continues to subsist; hence it is at best what logicians would call a particular proposition, and Mr. White, against every rule of reason, would make it the foundation of an universal conclusion; which is just as good reasoning as it would be to say that every priest was an infidel because Mr. White and a few of his profligate companions lost their faith. Again, though the Pope did upon special grounds interfere with the civil allegiance of some of his spiritual subjects, it is equally notorious that where those circumstances did not exist, he did not attempt to interfere with others. Many Catholic kings aided by their Catholic subjects, took the field against his allies, and did not thereby lose their faith or forfeit their character of his spiritual subjects even whilst they were his temporal opponents.

The gentleman next gives us this disjunctive proposition: "Either

the Pope was then an usurper, or he held his power by divine and immutable authority." Miserable sophist!—a very tyro would have told you that your disjunction admitted a mean, and that mean the fact. "It was not an usurpation, nor was it held by divine right, but by the concession and the institution of the princes and the people of Christendom." Suppose Bishop Kemp seated in the Presidential chair in place of Mr. Adams, by the fair and constitutional act of the American people; what would be thought of the intellect of him who would vauntingly proclaim, that [either] he was an usurper, or he held the Presidency by virtue of his being a Protestant Bishop. Yet the argument which would support this disjunctive would be just as good as that which for our sins, we are forced to bear with from men who are thought to have information. It is the sophism which argues that coincidence is the exhibition of cause and effect, just as good as the reasoning of a man who would say, that no one but a priest could discover and form our system of Astronomy, because it happened that Copernicus was a priest. Will our American doctors support the correctness of Mr. White's disjunction? Yet I am informed that some of them teach logic, and others are or have been professors of Theology! ! !—I should not be astonished if Parson Hawley asserted that it was an article of Catholic faith that our Saviour taught St. Peter how many soldiers would be necessary to defend the Papal territory, because Pepin and Charlemagne had about seven or eight centuries after his death given the territory to one of his successors!—It would be just as rational as the assertion which I have been examining.

The author of the *Evidence* then quotes the following passage from Mr. Butler, and begins his comment as will be found below.

"A chain of Roman Catholic writers on papal power might be supposed: on the first link we might place the Roman Catholic writers who have immoderately exalted the prerogative of the Pope; on the last we might place the Roman Catholic writers who have unduly depressed it; and the centre link might be considered to represent the canon of the 10th session of the Council of Florence, which defined that 'full power was delegated to the bishop of Rome in the person of St. Peter, to feed, regulate and govern the universal Church, as expressed in the general councils and holy canons.'[9] This (adds the author, in capitals) is the

[9] *Item, diffinimus sanctam apostolicam sedem, et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri principis apostolorum, et verum Christi vicarium, totiusque ecclesiae caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi unviversalem ecclesiam a domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse; quemadmodem etiam in gestis oecumenicorum conciliorum, et in sacris canonibus continetur. Conc. Flor. Labbe,* Tom. xiii, Col. 516.

doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church on the Authority of the Pope, and beyond it no Roman Catholic is required to believe."

"When I examine the vague comprehensiveness of this decree, I can hardly conceive what else the Roman Catholics could be required to believe. Full power to feed, regulate and govern the universal church, can convey to the mind of the sincere Catholic no idea of limitation."

In this too there is a want of honesty or want of intellect: I presume it is the first, because the commentator asserts, that there is no limitation: whereas a distinct limitation is expressed in the very passage as quoted by himself. That limitaton is the expression of the councils and canons, "as expressed in the general councils and holy canons." Now those general councils and canons have never extended the power of the Pope to temporals, but have always restrained it to spirituals, except when they recognized in special cases the grant of authority made by princes or people for their own benefit to the Pope. But those councils or canons never stated that he had any such power by divine right and immutably recognized as of faith. Another restriction is in the word Church itself, for the Church which is the congregation of the faithful, is a body established for spiritual objects, as a kingdom, an empire, a republic are bodies for political objects; as well might it be said that Congress can regulate our religious concerns, because it has full power to govern and regulate our confederation, as that the Pope and council have power to regulate our civil concerns, because they have full power to govern and regulate the Church. There is then a double limitation; the first is the very expression Church; the second in the restraining clause as expressed in the general councils and holy canons. It is therefore incorrect to assert that there is no limitation.

The remaining farrago of his paragraph of remarks is then answered upon the principle of the first distinction which he recognizes himself. We are bound by faith to believe that God gave to Peter and his successors, the full power of feeding with doctrine and sacraments, and regulating and governing by ecclesiastical discipline the universal Church; that the decisions of general councils and the canons of the Church exhibit the extent of his power is a fact, and that the power does not extend beyond what they exhibit, is clearly declared. It is clear that they who attribute to the Pope more power, do not deny that he has the quantity which the canons and councils define. But it is manifest that others are bound to answer for their private opinion in support of this more extensive power, because this charge is against what we have found to be correct, even by White's admission. Suppose what we all will easily understand, that the power of the President to make appoint-

ments to vacant offices of embassy, is fully acknowledged by all persons as our constitutional doctrine; some persons will also be found to assert that not only has the President that power, but much more, and of a different description. Several persons deny for instance that he has the power of appointing inspectors of national roads, others assert that he has such power. All agree that he has full power to govern the Union, as expressed in the constitution of the United States and the laws of Congress. What would be thought of the man who should assert that the phrase full power destroyed the limitation of the constitution and the law? Yet such is the construction which Mr. White would give, and by this construction, ridiculously affirm that his power is not full unless it extends to everything! !—This is the sort of mockery of reasoning which our assailants are in the habit of using. Would any man having a conscientious feeling of Religion thus quibble with the institutions of Heaven?

The succeedng passage of the *Evidence* betrays the sophistry.

"Whatever be the extent of the chain imagined by our author, the decree appears to have been framed wide enough not to exclude the link containing the writers who have most exalted the papal power. The task of those on the other extremity of the chain, is certainly more difficult; for it cannot be well conceived why mere human rights should be allowed to limit a full power to govern the minds of men, derived from a direct injunction of Christ."

The sophistry is now manifest; it is what logicians call arguing *a dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter,* that is, arguing from particular premises to universal conclusions in effect, as thus, "the Pope has power to govern you in every thing specified by the councils and canons, therefore he has such power in every case whether so specified or not." It is changing the middle term of a syllogism, as thus, "Catholics recognize in the Pope the full power which the canons and councils declare to be attached to his office. But full power to govern men's minds necessarily destroys human rights. Therefore Catholics recognize in the Pope power to destroy human rights." Such is the miserable disingenuity, which begs the very question in debate, by assuming that the canons and councils declare that the Pope has unlimited power to govern men's minds: and this assumption is made against the fact; for in truth we do not admit any such power to exist except in God himself. We look upon those who assert that we admit the existence of the Papal power to such an extent, to be very wretchedly informed of our tenets, if they believe the truth of their assertion; and if they do not believe its truth, we must

feel humbled, disgusted, and mortified, at the exhibition of our depraved and corrupted nature.

The author of the *Evidence* continues to state, [that] there is nothing in the Catholic decisions to exclude the Pope from having temporal power. We may verily answer, that neither is there any thing to assert that he has such power. Shall it be therefore concluded, that the canons recognize its existence? As well might it be argued, from the silence of our constitution and statutes, that Mr. President Adams has power to order one of our commodores to sail upon a voyage of discovery to the interior of the globe, because there is nothing in the constitution or laws of Congress to prevent him, and he has full power to order them to go where he may deem it necessary. It may be answered, that this was never contemplated in the power which the people and the States gave to the President. Neither was the exercise of temporal power included in the commission given to Peter, by Him who said that his kingdom was not of this world, and who sent the brother who disputed about property to the tribunal of the civil governor; and if Cisalpine writers will endeavor to draw the canon of Florence to mean that the Pope has temporal power by divine right, I will stop their progress until they produce to me the decision of a General Council or a holy canon, to establish the fact of this meaning having been ever admitted; and for this they will have to wait as long as the commodore would the return of Captain Symmes from his polar expedition to discover the ingress through which he would pilot the squadron to their novel destination.

In his page 47, the author asks whether the Pope did not issue a sentence of deposition against Elizabeth? I answer, yes, and in the face of Christendom. "Had not a similar practice prevailed," he asks, "for many centuries before?" To this I answer, that I do not know of a single parallel case to that of Elizabeth. There were several cases upon several grounds; but not one that I ever read of upon the same ground as this. "Was not this done by virtue of what the Popes conceived to be their divine prerogative declared in the Council of Florence?"

My answer is, no. Each case is to stand upon its own merits; and they do not all, nor perhaps do any two of the few which occurred, rest upon the same grounds of jurisdiction in the Pope who either deposed, or who attested the deposition.

I shall now make a case in which, by the law of England, the Pope would have had not only full power, but would be obliged to issue a sentence of deposition against Elizabeth.

Had the English people, as they might, declared that the wretched parliament which permitted Henry VIII to settle the succession of the

crown by his will, had exceeded its powers, and that the British crown could descend only to the legitimate heir; upon the question, whether Elizabeth was such legitimate heir, and thus capable of inheriting the crown; according to the ancient Christian law of all Europe, the decision must depend upon the validity of Catherine's marriage with Henry, and in an ultimate appeal upon this question by that law. The decision must have been given by the Pope, as the supreme judge in the Catholic Church of the validity of the marriage; which place he holds by divine right. In this, which however is not the exact state of the case, the Pope would, by divine right, have laid the foundation for her deposition, by proclaiming her mother's concubinage. But a question would still be reserved for the English nation, in the decision of which the Pope would have no divine right to interfere, viz. whether they would submit to her dominion, and make legal now what was originally an usurpation. The English people could, if they chose, do so, unless they were bound by some contract with another part not to use that right, or unless they had by some contract deprived themselves of that right, which they originally had. Before their religious defection, the nation formed a portion of a great confederacy of Europe, one of whose articles of agreement was that, in certain cases, of which this defection was one, the Pope upon the evidence of the fact should depose the delinquent ruler, and absolve the subjects from their fealty to the recreant. This confederation has long ceased to exist. But the jurists of the ages, when it did exist, argued for the validity of the power, upon the very same principles which keeps us now an united confederation, instead of being dissociated and weak republics. Besides being by divine appointment, the spiritual head of the Church, the Bishop of Rome was by the act and assent of the princes and States of Christendom, the President of the temporal confederation of those powers; and by their consent and act, he was frequently not only authorized but required to enforce by spiritual power the moral obligation of observing their compact, upon those who appeared to be disorderly, and to punish by spiritual censures, in the first instance, the contumacious; and these means being ineffectual, he then was directed to give sentence of deposition, which the other members of the union were to carry into execution; and his own subjects were released from their fealty to the delinquent, not by the power which Christ gave to Peter, though it was by that power the spiritual censures were issued, but by the power derived from the law of the Congress of those States; such as that law of the potentates of Europe, at the time of the Council of Lateran, in 1215, specially made for such a case. The Pope acted in virtue of this, and laws like this, and not by virtue of the

canon of Florence, which had no relation to the case in any way whatever.

I know that some writers never possessed heads, or had information sufficient to see the real state of the case; others who saw it clearly, thought fit intentionally and dishonestly to affect ignorance, and wrote as if there was no distinction. Mr. White may class himself under whichever head he pleases; but to one or the other he belongs. I have already extended this letter beyond my limits, and must break off here.

Yours, B. C.

LETTER XV

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 14, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—We have seen how unfounded is the charge made by White upon our Church, of teaching in the council of Florence, that the Pope has temporal authority by divine right. We have seen that the principle upon which the power of deposing monarchs was established, was temporal enactment. This alone would have been sufficient answer to those charges so often made and so often refuted, yet still brought forward. But on each occasion there is generally some variation in the mode of making the charges, and therefore there must be some also in the answer. On pages 47 and 48, White uses very ingenious sophistry to endeavor in some way or other to establish the fact, that the deposing doctrine is an article of Catholic faith.

Feeling convinced that the council of Florence will not serve his purpose, without abandoning whatever semblance of aid it may give him, he takes other ground.

It is a principle of our Church, that the Pope "may *promulgate definitions and formularies of faith, to the universal church,* and when the general body, or a great majority of her prelates have assented to them, either by formal consent, or by tacit consent, all are bound to acquiesce in them." This quotation he makes from Mr. Butler's book, and the principle is sound and correct. What are the requisites to command our acquiescence?

1. That what is promulgated must be either a definition of faith, or a formulary of faith. This is done in one of two ways, either by publishing that a certain doctrine therein stated has been revealed by God, and preserved and taught in the Church, and is to be believed as an article of faith; or by condemning the doctrine as contradicting what God has revealed, and the Church has taught, and forbid-

ding under censures any person to hold such heretical opinion, or to teach or favor the same.

In this case it is clear that a condemned doctrine is not tolerated; also that the defined doctrine is not tolerated, but is taught. This distinction between a tolerated opinion, and a doctrine of faith we have seen in my last letter, and it is recognized by White in the first paragraph of his letter ii, page 41.

2. The promulgation must be made to the universal Church, not merely to a portion thereof, and the matter must concern the whole Church, and not merely a portion thereof.

In this place we find that a document directed to a particular nation on its own special concerns does not, and never has been considered to come under this principle.

Mr. White, in page 47, asks respecting the deposition of Elizabeth, and so forth. "Did not the greatest part of the Catholic Bishops allow by their tacit or express consent, that the head of their Church was acting in conformity with the inspired definition of his power?" Miserable subterfuge!—Every student of theology could tell you that an act of the Pope is not a definition of an article of faith—that his reasoning to justify his acts whether good or bad is not a definition of an article of faith. I will suppose a stronger case than any act of deposition. Some few Popes have been notoriously bad men: suppose some one of those men, published to the Catholic world a declaration that he believed his criminal act was perfectly justifiable and was not a crime, surely it never could enter into any person's head that this palliation or attempted justification of his conduct to the world, was the definition of an article of faith. The acts of the Popes were not definitions; they had none of the conditions required in the first head, nor were they directed as required in the second to all the Bishops of the world. The Bishops of the country which was in question were the only prelates concerned. What concern, for instance of the Bishop of this Diocess, is it, if His Holiness should choose to inform the Bishops and people of Spain that he considers Ferdinand unfit to reign, and that in the name of God, he absolves them from all allegiance to him? But the case will be widely different, if His Holiness should absolve the good Catholics of South Carolina from their allegiance to their State or their contract with the Union, and place them under the persecution of the British penal laws, or under the tender mercies of his Spanish majesty. Though the Bishop of Charleston would protest against this act, and declare to his flock that it was of no authority, neither the British or Spanish Bishops would be expected to take the same trouble.

White himself, in page 47, feels this ground to be untenable, and quickly leaves it: declaring in page 48, his Papal bulls are not definitions or formularies, and therefore will not serve his purpose. Why then introduce them? To excite the fears of the timid, the doubts of the simple, the opposition of the prejudiced; and uniting those together to get a cry of no Popery for John Bull. But what has Bishop Kemp to do with this? Is he so ignorant as to be misled by this sophistry? I do not know. The good prelate may, for any thing that I know, be as learned as either Duns Scotus or St. Thomas of Aquin: but if he is learned, how has he given his approbation to this book: and what was his object in exciting unfounded fears of Papal influence in America?

The writer of the *Evidence* continues through the next two or three pages to excite the same alarms, by his guessing at what might be the reason for not defining that the Pope had no power over temporal concerns. The reason is plain. No decision is made in the Church except for the purpose of preserving safe the deposit of faith, that deposit is never in danger save by the denial of some revealed truth. They who assert that it is their opinion, that God gave temporal power to the Pope, teach what, though not a part of Catholic doctrine, yet does not contradict that doctrine, and therefore the Church has no authority to condemn or to censure them, any more than she has authority to condemn or to censure those who say they are mistaken. Suppose two mathematicians differ. One of them states that lines which bear a certain ratio to a radius will form the sides of a square which shall be equal to the circle; the other says that he mistakes. It would be as ridiculous for the Church to give a decision between them, as it would be for a court of equity or a court of law to make a rule, or an order upon the subject. The council of Florence decided that the Pope has power to a certain extent to govern the Church. In America, we know very well that the Church does not mean the State, and we want no Pope or council to decide for us, what we know too well to ask a decision, that he has no power to govern our State. We will not quarrel with those who say that he has, but, if ever he should attempt to reduce their opinion to practice in our case, we and our Protestant fellow-citizens will join to show our belief, as the English Catholics did in the time of Elizabeth; and a very sufficient proof that it was no violation of their doctrine is, that neither Pope or council ever attempted to accuse them of having acted irreligiously. I commend them for their noble opposition to foreign force, and for their alacrity to maintain British independence. But what says Bishop Kemp to their Protestant persecutors, who robbed and hanged and beheaded them as traitors after the common enemy was destroyed?

This single fact is better than any other answer to the labored sophistry of the unprincipled writer of the *Evidence*.

In page 52, he makes a side blow at the infallible council for the vagueness of its canon. The canon is not vague. It defines all that was necessary. The question was between the Greeks and the Latins, whether the Pope was the spiritual governor of all the Church, or only of the Western portion thereof, and the canon defined that he was member of the entire: the question was also whether this was by divine appointment, and it was decided in the affirmative. No question was raised upon the temporal power, and of course there was no vagueness in its omission. Some persons may if they choose, hold opinions of their own upon subjects which do not interfere with the doctrines of the Church, but the Church is not accountable for those opinions nor is she called upon to decide upon their truth or falsehood, nor would it be correct to allow the tribunal of the Church to make such decisions; as well might she be required to decide, whether Guthrum a British king made a present of Ireland to the Milesians about fifteen hundred years before the Christian era, as is asserted in an act of one of Queen Elizabeth's parliaments.

The writer of the *Evidence* next quarrels with the statesmen who guided the British council for the last quarter of the eighteenth century, as not knowing what was the true source of danger from papists, and not framing their questions to the Catholic Universities in a proper way: and he kindly tells the British and Irish Catholics, that "the trial, to which as British subjects they are exposed, is *perfectly* unconnected with the temporal claims of their ecclesiastical head: it flows directly from the spiritual." Do, my friends, then tell our Protestant fellow citizens, that it is avowed by the advocates of British Protestant persecution, that it is because of their belief in the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, the Catholics are persecuted. Tell our fellow citizens, that they have been misled by the Protestant writers who assured them that the British government cared nothing for the Pope's spiritual claims, they only resisted his temporal claims, and only punished those who would set him up as the monarch of their monarch! See too how White, or Southey, or whoever this writer is, now undoes all that he had through six pages urged against Mr. Butler, for having written that Catholics believed only that they were subject to the Pope's spiritual power. Yet now he says in page 52, that "he does not conceive the Pope's supremacy to have any practical effect in Great Britain." Why then are the Catholics persecuted? Why does the bench of bishops, with two splendid exceptions, regularly make the continuance of this persecution?

We now come to the question which this second wise man of Gotham would substitute for the three which by Mr. Pitt's desire were proposed to the Universities.

Can the Pope, in virtue of what Roman Catholics believe his divine authority, command the assistance of the faithful, in checking the progress of heresy, by any means not likely to produce danger to the Roman Catholic Church; and can that Church acknowledge the validity of any engagement to disobey the Pope in such cases?

Before answering this question, though I am not an University, I shall exhibit another which is put, and the answer which is given thereto in the Church of which Mr. White says he is a member. The question is put by the Archbishop to a person to be consecrated Bishop.

Q. Are you ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine, contrary to God's word; and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same? A. I am ready, the Lord being my helper.

The question by the Bishop to the person to be ordained priest.

Q. Will you be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word, and so forth. A. I will, the Lord being my helper.

Q. Will you reverently obey your Ordinary, and other chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting yourself to their godly judgments? A. I will do so, the Lord being my helper.

The person to be ordained deacon is asked the same question, and gives the same answer. Connected with those questions and answers, are the unquestionable facts that the English Protestant Church has never yet been one moment in existence without being uniformly a persecuting body. And that, amongst those who prominently, steadily, uniformly, and almost without exception maintained, justified, and instigated that persecution, were the archbishops and bishops of that Church. Would it then be an extraordinary assumption for me to say, that the clergy of that Church profess, that by the divine law they are bound to check the progress of the Roman Catholic religion, by any means not likely to produce danger to the English Protestant Church; and that the inferior clergy believe that by divine authority the Bishops ought to command their assistance for that purpose, and that they acknowledge the validity of their engagement to obey the Bishops in such cases, and that persecution of Catholics is therefore their conscientious duty, and that they therefore are bound to persecute Catho-

lics, and that they would not in conscience "regard with apathy efforts" to put an end to this persecution.

Every good member of the Church of England will cry out against these last consequences, which I have drawn; and will, in this reclamation, be joined by many sensible and just men of all persuasions, who will say that those consequences are not contained in the premises; that the clergy of the Church of England are of opinion that Catholicism is an evil, which they ought to oppose, but that although unfortunately that Church has always been united with the State in persecution sometimes severe and sometimes mitigated, still the true meaning of the answers above recited, is not to use unlawful means, or indecent or outrageous means, but such as become men in their place, viz. argument, instruction, prayer and watchfulness. I agree with them in this explanation; and I say that notwithstanding the unfortunate and unseemly fact of the English Protestant Church having always been maintained by persecution of others, especially of our Church; still the meaning of the passages above quoted does not lead to the necessity of persecution. I need scarcely adduce a fact, which we all observe every day to prove that they do not, viz. all the bishops and clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States have made similar declarations, and still only one bishop and a few priests have waged this war upon us.

But I demand in fair justice the benefit of the same principle which I concede; and I now answer the question which is put. 1. The Pope can command the assistance of the faithful by divine right, to check the progress of heresy, by all lawful means. 2. The Church does acknowledge the validity of any lawful engagement to disobey the Pope. And White has taken great pains to no purpose, because his question was contained in those put to the Universities, as may be seen by a reference to them. It would be unlawful and improper for a Catholic, as well as ridiculous to engage maintaining and abetting what he considered to be error, and no man of principle, whatever his religion may be, could enter into such an engagement as to do any positive act for promoting what he believed to be a delusion. But a person might engage, not to interfere for its destruction on a variety of occasions, or he might pledge himself to abstain from using certain means, which he might lawfully use had he not given such pledges, but which would become unlawful upon his making the engagement. Thus suppose I am prevented the use of a certain passage to my dwelling, lest I should remove some monument which was offensive to me, were I allowed to come within reach of it. Though I had the full right and obligation to destroy it, if I could freely reach it, I might when I found the avenue so

guarded as to make it hopeless for me to effect its destruction, and greatly inconvenient to me to lose the right of passage, make an engagement not to injure the monument during the concession of the right of passage. I am not prevented from making an engagement for sufficient cause, to refrain from doing an act which I would do if I were free. But to obtain that right I never could pledge myself to do what was in my estimation positively bad. Thus the British Catholics have uniformly refused to abjure their own religion to obtain their civil rights; but with the full consent and approbation of the see of Rome, they have sworn, not to use the power which has been conceded to them, for the purpose of destroying the Protestant Church established, in order to substitute a Catholic establishment in its stead. Thus during nearly half a century the very question which White would put as a substitute, has been practically answered by the oaths and acts of millions of Catholics, with the full approbation of the see of Rome: and upon this principle of morality, "You can never pledge yourself to do evil, but you may sometimes bargain to forego a lesser duty, that you may thereby attain a greater good."

Bishop Kemp and his associates are American citizens, I now put to them this difficulty of their protege White, and ask them before the American public, how they could as citizens of our confederated republics, support such doctrine as this book advances. White's address to the British Catholics is substantially this:

"You believe our Church to be erroneous, but we are established by law; if you are admitted to the Legislature, you will endeavour to destroy our establishment, such is your duty as good Catholics; you cannot act otherwise; we cannot depend upon any engagement into which you may enter, not to take away the property from us, to give it to your own Clergy; we therefore tell you, that if you are good Catholics, you ought not to go into a place, where you would have the power to destroy us, if you have not the disposition to do so."

If the Catholics were even disposed to act thus, though they have sworn not to act so, I ask the American clergy, could the measure be carried by the votes of the Catholic members, if the majority of the house and nation were not Catholics? And if the majority of the nation, as in Ireland, was Catholic, would the American Protestant clergy say that such a majority should lose their civil rights, their political rights, and be oppressed to keep up a dominant and domineering Church for the minority of the nation? Is this the doctrine we are to have imported into our republics? What would Bishop Kemp say of disqualifying all the Protestants of Maryland in order that a Catholic establishment

should tax and live upon the public of every denomination? Did he ever read or hear of a Catholic minority taxing and living upon a majority of persons of other religions and telling them, we shall keep you out of our councils, lest we might be forced to give up what we have acquired and preserved by force and persecution? Does France keep Protestants from voting upon the question of the taxes, and the appropriation to support the Catholic establishment, though that establishment has neither tythes, nor glebes, nor bishops' lands, nor the plunder of monasteries, nor the spoils of Protestant establishments? France is a bigoted Popish country, because she treats Protestants with justice, and England is a liberal country, because she plunders and oppresses Papists, and Bishop Kemp and his associates are liberal, because they praise this British persecution. Yours, and so forth,

B. C.

LETTER XVI

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 18, 1826.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—White's object, in introducing the case of James II, King of England, is to endeavor, as far as possible, to persuade Protestants that no Roman Catholic can conscientiously abstain from persecuting a member of any other Church. To effect this, he not only misstates the facts in the case of James, but he grossly and fallaciously mistranslates the answer of Bossuet: of which I shall give a correct version to accompany this, so that my readers may be able fully to estimate the credit which White deserves.

I shall give what he intended to be his argument. "A Roman Catholic can lawfully do nothing to favor heresy. But if he be a British legislator, he must concur in voting the sums necessary for supporting the Protestant Church, which he calls heretical. Therefore it will be unlawful for him to do his duty as a legislator: Hence he ought not to seek for emancipation."

Such is the substance of the reasoning in page 53, and so forth. I shall examine its principle. That principle is equally Protestant as it is Catholic, viz. "It is unlawful to aid in the promotion of error." And hence I have known hundreds of good members of the English and other Protestant Churches refuse to give any aid to Popery. I have known several very religious members of different Churches in South Carolina upon this principle, not only refuse to contribute to build a Catholic Church, but to send their children to a Catholic teacher, or ever to vote

for any member of the Catholic Church for any office; because it would encourage Popish error, which is worse than heresy, it being Idolatry. I have known Catholics who have in the same manner reduced the principle to like practice. The principle is abstractedly quite correct, but bigots misapply it; and if White were not a bigot of very sour feelings, he never would have deemed it possible to frame such an argument upon such a foundation.

I repeat it; the principal is correct. "You cannot lawfully encourage error." But you must do your duty, and the discharge of that duty is not the crime of giving unlawful encouragement to error. If you owe your neighbor one hundred dollars, which you know, he will, upon receiving, apply to the most corrupting purposes, you are not accountable for his misconduct; nor for its consequences; nor are you authorized to act dishonestly towards him, and over prudently in your own favor, by keeping in your purse what you so sanctimoniously tremble at paying. In a word, your fulfilment of your duty, is matter of strict obligation; his abuse of his means is matter of criminality in him, not of criminality in you. There was, however, a class of saints, and for aught that I know, there still is, which would, for the love of God, keep the money, and answer the application for payment with a homily upon the influence of the Gospel. But there, men were not Roman Catholics! as in this case, he who paid his debt committed no crime: so in the other, he who merely discharged his duty, gave no encouragement to error. The British constitution is said to be Protestant, that is, in other words, there is an established Church, which the constitution says must be supported.

The continuing to support an establishment which has been created by the government, and continued during several years, as a matter of course, is not forming a new aid for error. Nor is it the criminal bestowing of support: because it is not given to encourage error, but by virtue of a contract which has been long since made. Suppose a man leaves a piece of land to aid a society which teaches error: and I hire the land. When I pay my rent, I give my money to fulfil my contract: not to propagate error. The criminal was he who originally devoted the income to further the delusion: not he who pays what he bargained to give for the use of the property.

The Catholic legislator would be bound to maintain this constitution, and therefore to provide the means for supporting bishops and sextons, as well as judges and beadles. But, I may be asked, "when the Catholics would form a majority of the Lords and Commons, would they not discontinue the vote?" I answer, "that their vote is not necessary, for

the property is vested in the Church and not granted by Parliament," so that, the fear raised by White as to the safety of the Catholic's conscience in this case, is only a delusive affectation. "But would not Catholics vote to take away the property from the Protestant establishment in order to give it to a Catholic esablishment?" I answer that although the Catholics are not legislators, and therefore not the majority of those houses in which they are not allowed to sit: yet this possibility is guarded against, for they have sworn, and continue to swear, that they will not use any privilege which they have obtained or may become entitled to, in order to subvert or destroy the Protestant Church establishment in order to substitute a Catholic establishment in its stead. Besides, there is another security. The King must be a Protestant; and he should give his consent, and the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury is his first privy counsellor. "But, the two houses might take away the property, and thus destroy the Protestant establishment, without substituting any other therefor." I acknowledge this is lawful and possible, provided the King consented, but not otherwise. And should the majority of the houses be Catholic, the majority of the nation must be so. When that comes to be the case, the nation is fully entitled to say whether it will give to the clergy of a minority an income too great to support a Church establishment ten times too large for the whole people. But it is folly to write upon those chimeras as upon facts. Allow me, by a single instance, to show the valuelessness of Mr. White's bigotry. France has a legislature almost wholly Catholic, the King is a Catholic, the Church establishment is Catholic, several of the archbishops and bishops are Peers. Suppose Catholic emancipation fully conceded, and every place which a Catholic could fill, occupied by members of our Church: would the state of the British government be like what we find in France as to the occupancy of places by Catholics? Yet this Catholic King, those Catholic prelates, peers and people, levy taxes upon the French Catholics and Protestants, to support several kinds of Protestant clergy and Churches. And still, they hold the principle "that they ought not to encourage error." Neither do they encourage it. The persons who hold erroneous doctrines, are unfortunately under delusions which force cannot remove, and for the removal of which it is not lawful to resort to force. But as members of civil society, they claim only common rights, in return for common exertions; those rights cannot be justly withheld, and the granting of them is not made in favor of error, but of right. Suppose by virtue of a contract the erroneous party received more than its proportion, still this extra favor is now due by virtue of the contract, and can be no longer viewed

as the grant of encouragement, because it has become the result of stipulation in a bargain, and the terms of the contract must be observed.

But let us see what White says upon the subject of King James:

"At the time when I am writing this, one branch of the Legislature has declared itself favorable to what is called Catholic emancipation: and, for any thing I can conjecture, Roman Catholics may be allowed to sit in Parliament before these letters appear in public. A Roman Catholic legislator of Protestant England, would, indeed, feel the weight of the difficulty to which my suggested question alludes, provided his attachment to the Roman Catholic faith were sincere. A real Roman Catholic once filled the throne of these realms, under similar circumstances; and neither the strong bias which a crown at stake must have given to his mind, nor all the ingenious evasions proposed to him by the ablest divine of the court of Louis XIV could remove or disguise the obstacles which his faith opposed to his political duties. The source of the religious scruples which deprived James II of his regal dignity, is expressed in one of the questions which he proposed to several divines of his persuasion. It comprises, in a few words, what every candid mind must perceive to be the true and only difficulty in the admission of Roman Catholics to the Parliament of these kingdoms. What James doubted respecting the regal sanction, a member of either house may apply to the more limited influence of his vote. He asked 'Whether the king could promise to give his assent to all the laws which might be proposed for the greater security of the Church of England?' Four English divines, who attended James in his exile, answered without hesitation in the negative. The casuistry of the French court was certainly less abrupt. Louis XIV observed to James, that 'as the exercise of the Catholic religion could not be re-established in England, save by removing from the people the impression that the King was resolved to make it triumph, he must dissuade him from saying or doing any thing which might authorize or augment this fear.' The powerful talents of Bossuet were engaged to support the political views of the French monarch. His answer is a striking specimen of casuistic subtlety. He begins by establishing a distinction between adhering to the erroneous principles professed by a Church, and the protection given to it ostensibly, to preserve public tranquillity." He calls the *Edict of Nantes*, by which the Huguenots were, for a time, tolerated, 'a kind of protection to the reformed, shielding them from the insults of those who would trouble them in the exercise of their religion.' It never was thought, (adds Bossuet) that the conscience of the monarch was interested in these concessions, except so far as they were judged necessary

for public tranquillity. The same may be said of the King of England and if he grant greater advantages to his Protestant subjects, it is because the state in which they are in his kingdoms, and the object of public repose, requires it." Speaking of the *Articles*, of the *Liturgy*, and the *Homilies*, "it is not asked (he says) that the king should become the promoter of these three things, but only that he shall ostensibly leave them a free course, for the peace of his subjects." "The Catholics (he concludes) ought to consider the state in which they are, and the small portion they form of the population of England, which obliges them not to ask what is impossible of their king, but on the contrary, to sacrifice all the advantages with which they might vainly flatter themselves, to the real and solid good of having a king of their religion, and securing his family on the throne, though Catholic; which may lead them naturally to expect, in time, the entire establishment of their Church and faith."

"Such is the utmost stretch which can be given to the Roman Catholic principles in the toleration of a Church which dissents from the Roman faith. A conscientious Roman Catholic may, for the sake of public peace, and in the hope of finally serving the cause of his Church, ostensibly give a free course to heresy. But, if it may be done without such dangers, it is his unquestionable duty to undermine a system of which the direct tendency is, in his opinion, the spiritual and final ruin of men. Is there a Catholic divine who can dispute this doctrine? Is there a learned and conscientious priest among you, who would give absolution to such a person as, having it in his power so to direct his votes and conduct in Parliament as to direct the influence of Protestant principles, without disturbing or alarming the country, would still heartily and steadfastly join in promoting the interest of the English Church? Let the question be proposed to any Catholic university; and, though I am fully aware of the inexhaustible resources of casuistry, I should not fear to stake the force of my argument upon its honest and conscientious answer."

I shall not make any further comment upon this gross misrepresentation until after I shall have given the translation of the opinion furnished by Bossuet. Meantime, I request of you to peruse the original.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XVII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 1, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—Mr. White's object in page 53 and subsequent pages of his *Evidence,* was to shew that Catholics must, according to their principles, if vested with temporal power, in any country in which Protestants had Churches, or establishments, use that power to deprive them of those Churches and establishments, in order to stop the progress of error, and that it would be unlawful for them upon their principles to refuse obedience to the Pope, should he command them by such means to stop such progress. I before reminded you of an obvious distinction between lawful and proper means, and unlawful and improper means. I shewed that the Protestant as well as the Catholic, that every honest man is bound to use the former, and that no Pope or council can command the latter, and notwithstanding White's real or affected ignorance upon the subject, all the British Catholics have sworn and continue to swear, all the Catholic schools of Theology have taught, and continue to teach, that it would be sinful in a Catholic to do an unlawful or immoral act in obedience to the Pope or council, or upon the ground or under the pretext that it was done for the good of Religion, or the benefit of the Church. It is a principle as eternal and as immutable as God himself, that no moral evil, however venial, may lawfully be done, to procure any benefit however great.

No order of a Pope or council could justify a Catholic legislator in doing an act of political injustice to a Protestant, to stop the progress of his error. Upon this principle, as I before showed, the French government which is Catholic, gives Churches, and ministerial salaries and establishments for theological lectures and maintenance of scholars to Calvinists, and to Lutherans, and to persons who belong to the English Protestant Church. During several years, the Elector of Saxony was a Catholic, and faithfully executed the constitutional provisions in favor of Protestants and afflictive to Catholics. Several other instances might, if necessary, be adduced, but those two will suffice. It then is clear from principle, and from example, that White was either grossly ignorant or affected fear which he did not feel.

But my charge upon him is more serious. It is that of falsification, or what I can scarcely admit, total incompetence for his task. He adduces the example of James II, of England, who lost a throne because he could not betray his conscience. What an eulogy does he pass upon this unfortunate and abused monarch!—What must be the purity of

conscience produced by a religion which demands such sacrifices?—Does it not appear to be that which animated the first martyrs? Does it not exhibit in practice the principle of that injunction of the Saviour, so often and so emphatically repeated; that we should love his truth and his doctrine better than any thing which the world could bestow, better than life itself? A principle which does not palliate ten years of hypocrisy, of profligacy and of sacrilege, such as were spent by the champion of the British Protestant Religion, behind whose protection Bishop Kemp and his associates would place the Protestant Religion of America!—I shall take another opportunity of endeavoring to do justice to this mistaken though upright and liberal and tolerant and conscientious exile from a throne. The eulogy of White though not intended as a testimony in the favor of James, will content me for the present. That eulogy is given in my last letter.

I have charged upon Mr. White either falsification, or incompetency. The falsification is in the translation of Bossuet's answer in the case of James. I have had the original French inserted in the *Miscellany*, I now give what I conceive to be an exact translation. Of all men who ever wrote, White should be the last to expose himself to a charge of false translation: and when he is competent to teach Mr. Charles Butler how to translate Latin into English, he can by no means plead a special exemption upon the ground of his being a foreigner, whose native tongue is not English. He tells us, page 25, at the time of his arrival in England, "I had learned English in my childhood, and could understand it at this time, without difficulty." Page 15, he shews us that his father must have spoken the language. In 1817, he published at Oxford a series of lectures in English, page 34. He is also the author of *Doblado's Letters*, which are written in a style that would not disgrace the pen of the poet laureat of England. To assert then that Mr. White could not translate into English with perfect accuracy, any work from a language which he understood equally well, would be absurd. Mr. White knew French, because he informs us that the reading of a considerable portion of his life was in the standard works of that language. Yet he has falsified Bossuet's meaning in the extracts which he translated, and his attention was chiefly fixed upon the portion which he falsified, and he founded his argument upon the falsification. Where the Bishop of Meaux writes that the King of England is only bound to protect the external form and administration of the Protestant Church, as distinguished from aiding its progress in the minds and over the consciences of his subjects, or giving to it the protection of his own conscientious assent, White makes him write that the King "is *ostensibly*

to leave that religion a free course," and marks the word *ostensibly*, so as to fix upon it the attention of his readers, and thus impress them with the idea which is usually, I may say uniformly attached to that word in the English language, that the King was hypocritically to appear to do what he really did not; whereas the Bishop having drawn the distinction which is given above, between protecting its external form and administration on the one hand, and adhering to its errors, or aiding their extension in the minds of the people on the other, he says that the King only promises the first, and not the second protection, and asserts that he is really bound to perform what he promises: if this was not the case, where would be the necessity of inquiring what might be lawfully promised and performed?—When White himself was a hypocrite, he promised and professed every thing; so does every insincere and unprincipled person. But men who have regard for their promises and oaths, and mean to perform what they promise and swear, will be cautious to ascertain the meaning of the oath or of the declaration. Such was the case here; it was not an ostensible but a real protection which was required, such was also to be promised, and such might also be conscientiously given by preserving the form and establishment, and by keeping the Protestants really and not ostensibly in possession of tythes, Church-lands, glebes, offerings, fees, schools, colleges, universities and offices. How in the name of ingenuity itself could this be *ostensible* only? Though it was *external*, it was real and not *ostensible*. It is a most shameful perversion: it is not surpassed by that other false translation of a passage of Bossuet by an English Protestant writer, and which Doctor Milner exposed. In that case Bossuet writing of those persons who said that they were of the true Church of Christ, because they were persecuted, used the expression that toleration "suffering persecution," was not a distinctive mark of the Church of Christ, and the translator kindly gave it as a proof of the persecuting spirit of the Bishop of Meaux, and of the Catholic Church, "toleration (that is absence of a persecuting spirit) could not be a characteristic of the true Church." Yet these are the writers who arrogate to themselves superior talents, superior information, superior candor, superior liberality, more gentlemanly demeanor, than the Romish ecclesiastics! I call upon Bishop Kemp and his liberal associates to exhibit if they can, any one of those vilified ecclesiastics who has been guilty of such unbecoming mistranslation, in defence of his Church? Have the American Catholic clergy, or any portion of them, so far forgotten their own dignity as to import such productions as this from Europe, to fling with

their recommendation into the faces of fellow-citizens of other communions?

After this falsification, and after garbling the document in the text, though by some fatality for himself, he placed the copy in his appendix, he in his remaining paragraph upon the subject, again confounds what had been previously distinguished, as he could not in any other way arrive at the semblance of the conclusion which he desired to draw, viz. that a Catholic ought not to seek admission into the British parliament, and that the Protestant ought not to admit him. Here he assumes what has been so often disproved, viz. that a Catholic is bound by his religion to violate his promise and do an act of political injustice for the benefit of his Church, and that to correct the error of the Protestant he is bound to become a criminal. As to the duty of a member of the British parliament, I shall leave those whom it concerns to regulate [it]. I have but one object in view, which is to shew that the charge of political dishonesty for the benefit of Religion, and the charges of political subserviency to the Pope, for the benefit of the Church, or the diminution of heresy, which White made upon the Roman Catholics of the whole world, were both unfounded and unjust. That object I believe I have attained. I leave to others to say whether a member of any government is authorized by political justice to give to an hierarchy with which one third of the nation is not in communion a revenue drawn from the whole people, and ten times too great for the spiritual necessities of the United Kingdom at large. I leave also to my fellow-citizens to say whether the Catholics of the United States deserved to have these charges made upon them. Was it generous? Was it just?

In page 58, White complains that the Church had not made decisions enough for him to quarrel with, that she leaves to her children too much freedom of opinion upon questions of morality. Really this deserves a remark for its very novelty. So the Catholic Church is a tyrannical establishment which leaves her children too great liberty! It was but in the foregoing page he made a Priest deny absolution to an imaginary being, a Catholic member of the British parliament, for merely exercising his own judgment upon his own vote. His casuistry in the first place, is as defective as is his statement in the second. In his succeeding two pages he grossly misrepresents the doctrine of the Church, arguing from the exception made in the usual grant of the *Bull of Crusade*, that heresy is worse than deliberate murder, because the Priest receives power to absolve the penitent murderer, and does not receive power to absolve the penitent heretic. As well might he conclude, that a city which required that one slightly infected with the

small pox should be kept in seclusion, whilst it permitted his friends to visit a man dying of a mortal wound, looked upon the former to be in a more desperate state than the latter. Every one will see that in the first place the seclusion is not founded upon the desperateness of the case but upon the danger of the infection. So in morality, there are some crimes which, though atrocious, will not be the occasions of seduction, whilst others of a far less grade of immorality are more pernicious in their general and unchecked results. The object of the Church in expecting the case of heresy, in those countries which are altogether or almost Catholic, in the grant of jurisdiction, is not the punishment of the penitent, but the discovery by the proper authority of the sources of error that they may be removed, and the ascertaining that the unfortunate victim of delusion has been thoroughly convinced of his error, and is fully instructed in the grounds of the true doctrine. Mr. White, if he knew any thing of theology, must have been aware of this, and therefore was guilty of deliberate misrepresentation; if he was not aware of it, Bishop Kemp and his associates ought not to have told the public of his competency for his task.

As I know nothing of "the old man of the mountain, or of the Prince of the Assassins," [10] I can form no opinion upon the subject. But I shall conclude this letter with stating upon Catholic principles what would be the duty of a Catholic legislator in a land inhabited by a people whose religions differ as much as do the hundred religions of the people of England.

I shall first state what constitutes the crime of heresy. It is a wilful and obstinate denial of a truth revealed by God. Faith is the belief of such truth founded upon the divine testimony: Infidelity is the disbelief of that testimony, or the refusal to submit thereto: Heresy, a word derived from the verb aigeo "to choose" or "to select" is the admission of the principle that God has made a revelation, but a proud and arrogant choice or selection of some of the revealed tenets, and a wilful and obstinate rejection of the rest. Mr. White and his admirers may, for aught that I know, look upon heresy to be humility, they may consider it to be harmless and inoffensive to God: but I must avow, that I look upon it to be highly criminal and greatly destructive both of truth and of morality; and any person who knows that he thus chooses some of the doctrines, and rejects others revealed by God, is in my estimation a deliberate religious criminal whilst he so continues: but should

[10] Prince of the Assassins. The head of a tribe of religious fanatics inhabiting the hilly country of Persia, South of the Caspian Sea, who had also a Lieutenant in Mount Libanus, and who was exterminated by Holagon Khan, A. D. 1258.—Vid. Milman's *Gibbon*, Vol. iv, p. 253, Harper's Edit.

he even only suspect himself to be in this state, I consider it to be his duty sedulously to inquire and to use all means within his power to discover his true situation, because when God vouchsafes to teach man, it is the solemn duty of man to use every effort to know what he has taught. If a person having laid aside his prejudices, having earnestly besought God by prayer to enlighten and to guide him to the discovery of truth, and then honestly and diligently using the means which are within his reach, shall follow the sincerity of his conviction, though such a person might err in mistaking falsehood for truth, such error is invincible ignorance. White himself would not assert that prejudice ought to form a ground of excuse; he would not assert that sloth or indifference are good grounds of excuse, he would not assert that the person who omitted using any opportunity or mode within his power for the discovery of that truth to which God commanded him to adhere, was innocent. Nothing then but invincible ignorance can be a ground of excuse for heresy. If by "unconquerable conviction" White means invincible ignorance, I will freely accord to him that this will be a sufficient excuse. In answer to his last query, "If sincere conviction is a valid plea with the Roman Catholic Church, why has she scattered to the wind the ashes of those who allowed that conviction to be tried in her inquisitorial fires?" I beg to observe, that the structure of his question implies a falsehood, viz. that the Roman Catholic Church has scattered the ashes and lighted the fires. A proper opportunity will occur hereafter for proving the truth of my assertion. I will add that from personal experience, I have known several who under the influence of far less pride than would be requisite in this case, have died making deliberate declarations at perfect variance with their sincere conviction. Mr. White and his associates must excuse me for my avowal of an opinion in which I may be erroneous, that neither Melancthon, Calvin, Grotius or Usher, had a "learned conviction," or any other conviction, of the Roman Catholic religion being what they represented it to be. God, who is the great judge of conscience and who alone can read the heart of man is able to determine the question. I pass no judgment upon them: but if I were to judge from what I have seen, my testimony would be unfavorable to their "learned conviction."

Having thus given as distinctly as I could my remarks upon the nature of heresy, and the contents of Mr. White's pages, 61 and 62, I shall merely add that in a mixed state of society, the duty of a Roman Catholic legislator is to be regulated by the power which is conferred upon him. His duty is to legislate only for the temporal welfare of the State, not upon the religious concerns of the people. In such a

government as ours, which happily does not interfere with the religion of the people, and where the people from whom the legislator receives his power, forbid him to legislate upon religious concerns, it would on his part be an usurpation, which would be criminal, to use his power openly or covertly for the checking of heresy, or the elevation of his own Church. The act would be dishonest. In America there cannot arise any question upon this subject, although White's book to the uninformed is calculated to create distrust in Catholic candidates for our legislatures. It is not for me to determine how far Bishop Kemp and his associates intended this effect, neither is it for me to contrast the principle here laid down with the practice of others. In England, the case is different: there the constitution establishes one denomination, and the legislator accepting his place, binds himself to support the constitution, and of course to maintain this establishment. His duty is to observe his contract, and to support the establishment. The Catholic King and Government of France, upon this principle, maintain by the grants of the public money the Protestant and the Jewish establishments of Catholic France. The morality of the Catholic Church will bear the closest investigation. Strict justice, the full observance of contracts, and their most extensive construction in favor of the party upon which the benefit is to be conferred, form the basis of her moral code of intercourse with persons of all religions. She looks upon heresy to be a great crime in those who are its original creators and propagators, she looks upon it to be a great misfortune in those who are its innocent victims. But neither their crime or their mistake is a ground for making them the victims of injustice. Her children never legislated themselves into the property of older religion, and then mocked, insulted and persecuted and calumniated those whom they plundered.

When Bishop Kemp, or Blanco White shall have proved this crime against Catholic legislators, so far from holding them up as the champions of liberty and the models of religious perfection, I shall blush for my Church until she shall have cast them out from her communion; and should any portion of the plunder be found in my hands, my conscience will have no peace until I shall have made restitution; because I do not hold it to be more lawful for me to rob my neighbor for his Protestantism, than it would be for him to fleece me, because of my Catholicism.

Yours, and so forth,

B. C.

LETTER XVIII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 8. 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—In his sixty-second and subsequent pages of what he calls his *Evidence*, White has the following passage:

"I rejoice to find the dogma of intolerance branded in the *Book of the Roman Catholic Church* with the epitaph of *detestable*;[11] but cannot help wondering that a man who thus openly expressed his detestation of that doctrine should still profess obedience to a See, under whose authority the inquisition of Spain was re-established in 1814. If Catholics are so far improved under the Protestant government of England as to be able to detest persecution, by what intelligible distinction do they still find it consistent to cling to the source of the intolerance which has inundated Europe with blood, and still shows its old disposition unchanged, wherever it preserves an exclusive influence? In what church did Spain learn the necessity of forbidding her subjects, forever, the right of choosing their religious tenets, and that at the very moment when she was proclaiming a free constitution? Who has induced the republican governments of Spanish America to copy the same odious laws in their new codes?—That Church no doubt, who looks complacently on such acts and declarations, in countries where even her silence stamps public doctrines with the character of truth. Yes; the 'detestable dogma of religious intolerance' is publicly and solemnly proclaimed in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church, without a single observation against it from the Pope or Bishops of that Church; nay, the legislators themselves are forced to proclaim and sanction it against their own conviction, because the mass of the people are allowed by the Church to understand that such are their duty and her belief.

"If the Roman Catholic Church can thus allow detestable dogmas to act in full force within the inmost recesses of her bosom, those Catholics who differ from her notions, so far as her apologist, Mr. Butler, might guide themselves in religious matters without the assistance of her infallibility. That able writer allows himself to be blinded by the spirit of party, when he labors to prove that intolerance does not belong exclusively to his Church; and charges Protestants with persecution. That Protestants did not at once perceive the full extent of the fundamental principle of the reformation—the inherent right of every man to judge for himself on matters of faith—can neither invalidate the truth of that luminous principle, nor bind subsequent Protestants to

[11] Page 303, 1st ed. Page 254, Am. ed.

limit its application. It is a melancholy truth, that Protestants did persecute at one time; but it is a truth which rivets the accusation of inherent and essential intolerance upon that Church, whose erroneous doctrines the patriarchs of the reformation could not cast off at once. Thanks be to the protecting care of that Providence, which, through them, prepared the complete emancipation from religious tyranny which Protestants enjoy at this moment; the infallibility of their churches made no part of the common belief on which they agreed from the beginning, or the spirit of intolerance would only have changed its name among us. The dogma of an infallible judge of religious subjects is the true source of bigotry; and whoever believes it in his heart, is necessarily and conscientiously a persecutor. A fallible Church can use no compulsion. If she claims 'authority' on matters of faith, it is to declare her own creed to those who are willing to be her members. The infallible judge, on the contrary, looks on his pretended gift as a miraculous, divine commission, to stop the progress of what he condemns as an error. He persecutes and punishes dissenters, not because they cannot be convinced by his reasons, but for obstinate resistance to his supernatural authority. Rome never doomed her opponents to the flames for their errors, but for their contumacy. It is by this means that she has been able so often to extinguish sympathy in the breasts of her followers; for error excites compassion, while rebellion never fails to kindle indignation."

In this extract we find the following assertions or propositions to be contained, or palpably insinuated, viz:

1. That the detestation of intolerance cannot exist in that Church, under whose authority, the inquisition of Spain was established in 1814.

2. That if the Catholics of England and Ireland detest intolerance, they ought not to cling to the See of Rome, which is the source of intolerance.

3. That if the British and Irish Catholics detest intolerance, they are improved by having been under their Protestant government.

4. That the Roman Catholic Church shows its old disposition of persecution unchanged, wheresoever it has exclusive influence.

5. That the Roman Catholic Church induced Spain and the South American governments, to forbid their subjects and citizens for ever to choose their religious tenets, at the very moment that they proclaimed free constitutions, and that this was an odious act.

6. That she did all this mischief by her silence; neither Pope nor Bishop lifting his voice against the detestable act.

7. That the legislators were obliged to make those laws against their own conviction, because the Church left the people under an impression that such was their duty.

8. That they who assert that intolerance does not belong exclusively to the Catholic Church are blinded by the party spirit.

9. That the Catholic Church is answerable for the persecution of her own children by Protestants, when at one time the Protestants did persecute.

10. That Protestants do not believe their Church is infallible, and therefore can use no compulsion.

11. That an infallible judge of doctrine considers himself divinely commissioned to stop the progress of error.

12. That Rome never doomed her opponents to the flames for their errors, but for their contumacy.

Believe me, my friends, when in the sincerity of my soul I assure you, that I never approached any subject with awe and disgust, equal to what I now feel at the necessity of examining and exhibiting the result of the examination of those propositions. Would to God, I could do so without the harrowing of soul which is produced by heartless men who force us to recollect what we would strive to forget! ! I believe that several of my Protestant fellow-citizens read these letters. Let me assure them in all the sincerity of soul, that I do not attribute to them as a body, nor to their Churches, at present, the horrid sentiments which if I were disposed to act like Blanco White, and Bishop Kemp, and Dr. Wilmer and their associates, I could with strict logical justice charge upon almost every Protestant Church in the United States; whilst I shall also show that by no principle of logic, by no rule of right reason, could the Catholic Church be charged with what those assailants have thought proper to impute to her.

I would once for all address my Protestant fellow-citizens to the following effect:

"*Friends and Brethren,*—Your fathers have been led to separate themselves from our fathers, and to charge upon them several religious errors. Your fathers were invited to cast off the superstitions and the impostures which they were told our fathers and they had been slaves to. They were invited to search the Scriptures, that in them they might find the knowledge of truth. They took up the sacred volume, and in their search for truth, which is one and invisible, they have been separated into hundreds of sects, all contradicting each other. Centuries have elapsed, and the progress of years only multiplies your divisions; even you, yourselves have so far lost all hope of discovering in those sacred

books an uniform and a consistent declaration of truth, that in your despair of effecting it, you have adopted the extraordinary conclusion that, although you could not remain in our communion, because we held erroneous doctrine, still you may agree to contradict each other in harmony and affection. This evil is not of your own creation. But whilst you thus despair of union, and are multiplying your divisions and your contradictions, we, by following up the same principle which kept your progenitors and ours during centuries in a happy union of belief and affection, are still an united body, though spread through every nation of the universe; and we still hold as the standard of our faith, not only the sacred volume of the inspired writings, but every decision which our predecessors, during eighteen centuries, have given for its explanation.

"We do not think that we ought to abandon this host of evidence; and should we leave it, we know not whither to have recourse for any testimony of nearly equal value.

"But it is not the chief ground of my appeal and remonstrance, that we are told that it is erroneous, on our part, to hold fast to this principle; no, I complain that we are grossly misrepresented to you. Your fathers and ours have unfortunately not kept within the bounds of moderation, or of decorum, or of justice, or charity. They have persecuted each other. Do not imagine that I intend to wound your feelings, when I assert that I could easily prove that in the mutual persecutions which occurred, and still are occurring, our fathers have suffered, and our brethren are suffering ten-fold more than they inflicted. My first cause of complaint then is, that the Roman Catholics are said to be the sole, if not the principal, aggressors. My next complaint is, that from inferences sought to be drawn from our tenets and our acts, it is attempted to be proved that we must in principle be persecutors. Far be it from me to charge you with being persecutors upon principle. On the contrary, I give this public testimony to your general feelings of liberality, and to your many acts of kindness to Roman Catholics in many parts of this Union, although it has happened, as it must happen in all large bodies, that there are amongst you men, whose virulent spirit would lead them to be persecutors, if they had the power. However, as those arguments which they use can, I think, be best met by turning their principle against themselves; allow me to exhibit how easily upon that principle it can be shown that Protestants are bound by their religious tenets to persecute Catholics. If, then, we find that, although such a conclusion flows from your books, and the acts of your fathers; still it is neither your practice as a body, nor your disposition as individuals; we might obtain from you in return a like acknowledg-

ment in our regard, and thus the rhapsody of those mischievous men who seek to excite you against us, may cease to produce any effect, save that of placing themselves in that point of view which is their proper station.

"In my deductions, then, although I shall prove that your books and the acts of members of the Protestant communions, would exhibit the most marked spirit of intolerance, my object is peace and harmony, not irritation and reproach, and I altogether disclaim any intention of charging intolerance upon either any one Church, or the aggregate of the Protestant Churches of the United States. But I desire to create harmony, if I can, by my putting to silence, if possible, those who charge the Catholics with intolerance and persecution."

Having given this prefatory explanation to my Protestant fellow-citizens, I proceed to examine the assertion of Mr. White's paragraph.

His first proposition is founded upon a falsehood. It was not under the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, but under the authority of King Ferdinand VII, of Spain, that the inquisition was established in 1814. But this re-established tribunal has not burned, or hanged, or beheaded any Protestants as far as I could learn. Again, when that tribunal was abolished by the Cortes, and Ferdinand or some of his courtiers desired its re-establishment about two years since, the Pope used all his influence in favor of its suppression, and it has not been re-established. This was so notorious a fact, that it could not have escaped White's knowledge, and therefore his proposition contains an injurious suppression of the truth, and a bold suggestion of falsehood.

Respecting his second proposition, in so far as it assumes that Rome is more intolerant than Canterbury, I shall in the sequel prove it to be a most unfounded charge. At present, all the Protestant Archbishops in the world vote regularly to keep in force a code of persecution against the British and Irish Catholics. The See of Rome persecutes no one on account of religion. I call upon Bishop Kemp and his associates to name the people, or the individual now persecuted for conscience' sake by the See of Rome.

The third assertion is the most unfortunate which could have been made, because that government which has now during nearly three centuries been the most unrelenting and sanguinary in its inflictions upon the score of religion is not the best calculated to teach toleration. However, there is one meaning which the isolated proposition might have, whose truth I willingly admit, but that is not in the meaning which it bears in Mr. White's context, viz. that the intolerance of the Protestant government of Great Britain and Ireland has created in the British and

Irish Catholics an extraordinary detestation of the principle of intolerance; and as no person will more strongly detest injustice than he who being naturally just has also been greviously afflicted by the injustice of others. In this way, indeed, perhaps there has been strength added to the natural detestation of intolerance, which has always characterized the Irish nation, and which is common to British and Irish Catholics.

Respecting the fourth assertion, I beg leave to assure the Prelate and his associates, that the Roman Catholic Church has no disposition to persecute, that it had not at any time such a disposition, and that it does not show it in any one place, and consequently not in those places where it has exclusive influence. Let us go to Rome, and ask, are the Protestants in that city persecuted? Through all Italy, in Austria, in France, that Church has exclusive influence, and I defy the Prelate and his party to adduce a single manisfestation as they charge. I say the same of Bavaria; I say the same of Portugal. I ask how many have suffered persecution for their religion from the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico? in Columbia? in Brazil? or on the whole continent of South America? Let them name the Protestants who have suffered, and I pledge myself to name a plundered and persecuted Catholic in Maryland, and a Catholic priest put to death for his religion under Elizabeth, for every such name they may adduce. The American people are not to be treated like infants. They are not to be terrified with stories of a raw-head and bloody bones. They have sound sense, keen discrimination, calm and reflecting understanding; they are accustomed to the examination of evidence; and the vague and general and sweeping assertions, which would satisfy the mind of honest John Bull, will not pass current with Jonathan. I cannot call upon Mr. White, who is not here, to give facts; but I will call upon those who have linked their character to his assertions to do so.

It will be observed, that I have omitted Spain in the above enumeration. I will now adduce Spain herself. Not many months ago, the papers contained an account of a Spanish *Auto da fe*, and told us, for the discredit of the nineteenth century, that a Jew had been burned for his religion in Spain, in the year 1826. I now upon the authority of the European journals, pronounce this to be a vile fabrication of the remnant of French Infidels, who, not content with having made their own fine country the prey of wild anarchy, because of their hatred to religion, now endeavor to assail the Church in Spain, under the pretext of reforming the government. I ask, then, what Protestant has suffered persecution in Spain? I shall give you names upon names from England, from Ireland, from Switzerland, and from other places. I call upon

those good men to show me in this last quarter of a century any case of Catholic persecution of Protestants, in any part of the world, to equal the single case of Mr. Haller, in Switzerland.

The fourth assertion is a vague, unsupported charge, which I am prepared to rebut, when an attempt shall be made to support it by proof.

The fifth asertion has more semblance of truth than has any of the others. It is true that the Roman Catholic Church teaches, that whilst man is free to adopt any civil constitution which may be most useful to the general body, she declares that it now is, and ever will be unlawful for any man, or set of men to choose which of the revealed tenets he will preserve, and which he will reject. It is a principle of natural reason that man has no right to reject truth and choose error, because adherence to truth is one of his fundamental and original obligations. It is also a principle of Christianity that every tenet given by Christ is true. It necessarily follows that although man may be at liberty to choose his form of civil government, he has no right of choice and never can have such right respecting the tenets of religion which God has revealed. Although therefore I do not admit the fact that the Roman Catholic Church induced Spain and South America to forbid this choice, I am satisfied to assume all the consequences of admitting that they were so induced. I would advise the persons who adopt Blanco White's assertions to make the same charge upon North Carolina and New Jersey, which allow no choice of Catholicism without disqualification.

It is a very extraordinary mode of persecution to be silent, yet this is the extent of the sixth assertion. Great Britain exhibits it in another mode, and when I come to contrast Protestant persecution with Catholic, we shall find that the Protestant Churches knew how to speak. If the Church should speak against persecution, it would be then perhaps charged, if her advice was followed, that the people were priest-ridden. I once knew a parish priest in Ireland, who was in danger of being hanged because he interfered successfully with some Catholic insurgents and saved the life of a Protestant opponent, upon whom they were about to execute very summary justice or injustice. It was said, that other Protestant and Catholic loyalists had been put to death, and it was evident that this priest, as he saved one man whom he saw, could, if he would, have saved those whom he did not see; as he did not, he was guilty of their blood, and ought to be hanged. Upon the next application of Catholics for emancipation, it was argued in Parliament from a few facts of this description, that the Catholics ought not to be emancipated, because they were so far slaves to their priests that they were unfit for freedom. A Protestant friend to emancipation, observed in

jest to one of his acquaintances, that he would advise the priests to inform their flocks that there was no chance of their obtaining justice until they violated every law of the decalogue, and every ordinance of the Church, to show their fitness for freedom. This is a miserable subterfuge; we shall pass to the next.

In sober sadness, I would ask, can those men who join White in complaining that a legislator has conformed to the will of his constituents, be American citizens? Thus, what is the jet of this proof of persecution? The people tell their legislators, that they want no choice of religious tenets; the legislators adopt the language of the people in their enactment. Who has been persecuted? Is it the people who call for the article? Is it the legislator that enacted it? Upon what evidence is it stated that this was done against the conviction of those who did it? There is no proof of the truth of the assertion, but there is *prima facie* evidence of its falsehood: and the principle of the complaint [contained in it] is a direct attack upon the rights of the people.

I have already made this letter so long that I do not wish to enter upon any examination of the remaining assertions until my next.

Yours, and so forth,

B. C.

LETTER XIX

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 15, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I shall dwell very slightly at present upon the eighth assertion in the passage which I quoted from White's work, viz. "That they who assert that intolerance does not belong exclusively to our Church are blinded by party spirit." The proposition is divisible into these parts. I. The Roman Catholic Church is intolerant. If the meaning of this is, that she cannot tolerate that error should be taught as truth, I am very free to admit its correctness, and that of the other parts, because indeed, and she only makes it a condition for her communion that you shall receive all truth and reject all error: whilst almost every other Church, with truth and error before you, allows you to select pretty freely. In general there are some tenets which each peculiar division insists upon, and some others which it requires you to reject; but as respects the great bulk of doctrine you may please yourself. Thus the Episcopalian Protestant requires that the order and character and government of Bishops be recognized, but as regards the doctrine of the Eucharist, each person is left free to choose any one of the variety of

methods which have been devised to explain the words, "This is my body." Neither is it necessary to conform to any particular standard as to a variety of other doctrines concerning which it is acknowledged specific tenets were taught by the Saviour. But this is not what is meant by the intolerance which White and his abettors charge upon the Catholics exclusively: the word in its context means persecution, or the infliction of temporal pains or penalties. I then deny that the Roman Catholic Church does inflict persecution for errors in faith, although Roman Catholic temporal governors and legislators did at times inflict them, not generally for error, but for its consequences to civil society. White himself says that Rome never doomed her victims to the flames for their errors.

The second part of the assertion is: Our Church only was thus intolerant. I have denied that the Church persecuted; it is not my business to prove the negative, it is their business to prove the truth of their assertion; when they attempt it, I shall meet them, if God spares my life. Now I assert that Protestant governments were and are intolerant.

I shall not adduce the examples of ages long gone. I shall not leave Bishop Kemp much trouble. I say the Protestant government of Maryland is intolerant. I say, the Protestant colonial governments of New England and Virginia, and the Carolinas, of Georgia, and of New York, were intolerant. At this day the Protestant governments of North Carolina and of New Jersey are intolerant. In Europe the Catholic government of France is tolerant, the Protestant government of England is persecuting. I will not go farther at present, though I could add to the catalogue at each side. With those facts before their eyes, how could those pastors of Churches, make to the American people, through Blanco White, that third part of their assertion, that the declaration of those facts could be made only by persons blinded by party spirit? I apprehend my readers will think the party spirit might be found on the other side.

The ninth assertion is indeed the most extraordinary that ever issued from the pen of any writer. When it became too evident for the most hardy to deny, that Protestant reformers and governments did persecute Catholics and each other, the miserable subterfuge was taken of asserting that this was done only by the patriarchs of the reformation, who had not sufficiently laid aside the bad principles of Popery, and thus Popery, and not Protestantism, was justly chargeable with the atrocity. Maclaine, in a note which he appends to his translation of Mosheim, gives it as the excuse for Calvin's procuring the burning of Servetus. The assertion is one of those whose very boldness almost as-

tounds so as to unfit the mind for examining its foundation: however it is one whose very absurdity is so apparent, that we need only contemplate, we need not reason for its refutation. In whom is the spirit of Protestantism to be founded, if not in Luther, in Calvin, in Cranmer, in Beza, in Knox? Will Bishop Kemp and his associates blush for the conduct of their leaders? Surely those great lights of religion are not to be called Roman Catholics, whilst they endeavor to demolish the Roman Catholic Church? [In this case,] they would now be rejected by both Catholics and Protestants. Suppose in addition to all the crimes imputed to us, or if they will, committed by us or our forefathers, we take the crimes of their patriarchs upon our shoulders; still an enormous load remains to be disposed of. Did the persons who persecuted the English Puritans, bring their principles from our Church? Did the Puritans who persecuted the Episcopalians, bring their principles from our Church? Was it from our Church they whom the Maryland Catholics gave a place of refuge from their mutual destroyers, and elevated to an equality with themselves, learned to unite against their generous hosts, and repay their affection by a plundering persecution? Was it our Church taught the English nonconformists to persecute the Bishops, and those Bishops and their adherents to persecute the non-conformists? Was it our Church taught them both to unite in devising against herself the most atrocious code of systematic persecution that any legislator [has ever] enacted, or any savage executed? Is it the Catholic Church which teaches the British house of Lords to continue to persecute her own children? Let those questions be answered before the assertion be again made without a blush. But there is a disingenuousness in the admission of the writer, which is more discreditable than even if he had been silent. "When at one time the Protestants did persecute." Let him name a day from the origin of the secession from our Church, and their obtaining the aid of the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, and other princes, to the present day, on which they did not persecute more or less extensively. Thus the one time, began three centuries ago, and God only can say when it will terminate.

The tenth is but the assertion of a principle, as flowing from an acknowledged fact; the truth of which is freely admitted, viz. "Protestants do not believe their Church infallible, and therefore can use no compulsion." I will only suggest the correct conclusion, "and therefore ought not to use compulsion." In the name of all that is extraordinary, how can a Protestant charge a Catholic with error, if neither that Protestant, nor his Church, is infallibly certain of what is truth? How can one Protestant say that another errs or mistakes, when he has no certainty

that he is himself right? Upon what principle do the Constitutions of North Carolina and New Jersey exclude Catholics from offices? Yet we have before us abundant evidence of three centuries of persecution inflicted by Protestants upon Papists for their errors! ! ! We shall see, at another time, the pretty names which we are called in confessions of faith and books of homilies, and catechisms printed and published in the United States, by the highest ecclesiastical authorities of several Protestant denominations, within the few years of the present century.

But this assertion is made by the very man who tells the parliament of England, that the Duke of Norfolk ought not to be admitted to his seat amongst the peers of England, because he is a Roman Catholic. Shall I be answered that I am blinded by party spirit if I say this is intolerance and inconsistency? This is the man who stated the necessity of a political incarceration for the fellow-countrymen and fellow-religionists of his ancestors, because they would not apostatize from the Roman Catholic religion. Shall I be told that I am blinded by party spirit, if when I see a Protestant government and a Protestant hierarchy reduce the principle to practice, I say, that intolerance does not belong exclusively to the Roman Catholic Church? What a multiplicity of contradictions is he involved in, who undertakes to defend a bad cause? Did the Right Reverend and reverend approbators give their attention to this passage? Will they understand to reconcile contradictions?

The eleventh assertion is, "that an infallible judge of doctrine considers himself divinely commissioned to stop the progress of error." I shall upon this, remark that the judicial and the executive powers are not always united; hence it does not follow that because the Church has received a divine commission to decide with infallible certainty as to what doctrine God has revealed, she has also a divine commission to execute the process for checking the error in any other way than by her judicial decision. But though White's logic is bad, yet in truth the Church does hold a divine commission to execute the sentence of the judicial tribunal. But another very obvious question remains, viz. To what can that sentence extend? I assert that it cannot extend to life, or to limb, or to any compulsory, corporeal infliction, or to any civil pains or disfranchisements, or to any pecuniary mulct. The authority which the Church has and claims is purely spiritual, and these are inflictions by virtue of temporal power, which the Church does not possess or claim, except by compact or concession.

The infallible judge of doctrine is then divinely commissioned to stop the progress of error, by spiritual power, and not by any persecution or temporal or civil punishment. If the good gentleman will pro-

duce to me any canon of the Church which decides that it is our doctrine that the Church or council has the power of inflicting penalties of such a nature, let them be produced; until they are so produced, let the charge be considered not proved, denied, unfounded.

Here, though I would by no means be thought to justify or to palliate the acts of a persecutor because he was a Catholic, I may very clearly point out an enormous aggravation which necessarily, from the very nature of the case, and by White's avowal, marks the crime of the Protestant persecutor. The Catholic having the testimony of truth from what he believes to be an infallible tribunal, has no doubt of the correctness of his own doctrine and is certain that his opponent is in error. When he persecutes this opponent, he is convinced that if even by this mode he can procure his change of belief he will do the sufferer a spiritual good: and he feels that he is only endeavoring to eradicate error, and to establish truth. The Protestant persecutor, on the other hand, having no infallible guide, is liable to err: he cannot be certain that he holds the true doctrine, it is possible the truth may be on the side of the sufferer. Thus he is exposed to the hazard of wresting the truth of God, and banishing his doctrine from the earth as far as in him lies. I would call each persecutor a criminal, but White himself must acknowledge that the Protestant is far more criminal, not because of the greater liberality of his Church, which we shall find not to be the case; but because he acts, not from a plain certainty that his is the cause of truth and of God, because for that, he must claim to be infallible; but from his attachment to perhaps an erroneous opinion.

In the case of Great Britain the crime of the Protestant is still farther aggravated. The Catholic doctrine was universally prevalent, it was handed down from generation to generation as what Christ had taught, it was conformable to what the great bulk of Christendom had received from preceding generations, and all testified to have been the system established by the Redeemer: the Protestants introduced what was then a novelty, asserting that it was what had originally been given, but subsequently lost; and to support their assertion they gave their opinion that such was the meaning of the scriptures, avowing that in this opinion they might be under a delusion, because they were not infallible. The Catholics told them that in fact they were mistaken in the interpretations which they gave the text; and that they not only had the testimony of their progenitors, and the bulk of Christendom to support this assertion, but that they had the judicial decision of the tribunal which from the earliest ages had been considered the infallible witness of the proper meaning of the Scriptures, in their own favor.

But, aided by the civil power, those very Protestants who admit the possibility of their error, persecute the Catholics who say they cannot be wrong, because they will not abandon this host of evidence to embrace opinions which they look upon as erroneous, and whose very orignators and abettors avow [that they] might possibly be wrong. Yet White vindicates this process, and still declaims against persecution; and I blush to add; his book is published with official approbation in the United States, by men who would be considered liberal and charitable! ! !

White's twelfth assertion was, "that Rome never doomed her opponents to the flames for their errors, but for their contumacy." So, then, White contradicts all those who assert that Rome burns people for their erroneous doctrines! Really this from him is a very precious admission. Why I have read productions which are as firmly believed as is the Gospel by millions of our fellow-citizens, relating the horrid sufferings of persons burned for their imputed errors, by Rome; and I have no doubt but honest John Bull, who really has a soft heart, has shed as many tears as would extinguish all the fires of all the *auto da fes* of Spain and Italy over the detail of those sufferings. How many a thunderer from stump or pulpit, at our own side of the Atlantic has horrified his auditory by the appalling recital? How general is the impression at this very moment through these States, that Rome would if she could burn every one who holds what she calls error? But now White tells us that she never doomed them to flames for their error! ! ! But she did it for their contumacy. Here then I close with the abettors and applauders of White, and I ask Bishop Kemp to furnish the public with the name of any one person of the religion professed by him or by any one of his associates, whom Rome ever doomed to the flames. I wish to meet the opponents of my Church openly and plainly upon fair ground, before the American public. Before that tribunal I love to plead: for although the current of public opinion, and of public feeling is strongly running against my side of the question, I know, that if I can once get the mind of America to examine the case fully and fairly, I shall have ample justice. Here then is a bold statement that Rome has doomed her opponents to the flames. The assertion has been made so frequently and in so many ways, as to create upon the public mind the impression that this is, or at least was an usual occurrence, that it was systematic and flowing from principle. If true, it is susceptible of proof: that proof is easy: it consists merely in enumerating names, and relating the circumstances. I now call publicly for the proof. What are the names of those Protestants or other religious opponents whom Rome condemned to the flames? What contumacy arising from error

did they exhibit? What was the alleged error of the sufferer? Under what Pope, and in what year was he doomed to the flames? Was he burned? In what credible history is the statement to be read? I call upon Bishop Kemp and his associates, and to them I say, "produce your proof, or be silent, and convicted of having made a horrible charge which you cannot substantiate, a charge which is untrue. I charge you with having calumniated the Roman government, and the Roman Catholic Church. The Editors of the *Miscellany* have promised to insert your specifications in answer to my questions, if you furnish them: thus you can have no excuse for your neglect, neither is it a trivial and an unimportant concern, that you have wantonly assailed by the republication and adoption of White's calumnies, more than two hundred thousand of your fellow-citizens. Give then the names and the particulars, and save your names from the result of your charge and your neglect; neither can it be an excuse for you, that I do not affix my name to this demand; that name, humble as it is, shall never be withheld when circumstances may require its manifestation; for the present it is enough that you have assailed a body of which I am one, and you are answerable to every or any one of us, until you shall have proved that we are guilty, and that you are innocent. You have not only aspersed our moral character, and flung contumely upon our understandings; but you have endeavored to exhibit us as monsters, unfit for the participation of those rights and liberties which we hold in common with yourselves. You have done this to a body of which I am an individual member, and I call upon you for the proof of one of the most trivial of your assertions. Your respect for own character demands from you the proof, if you possess it. You have but to write and transmit it, and it shall be published."

I have thus disposed for the present of the passage so far as regards your own Church. It is time before I enter upon other topics to try the Churches of some of the Protestant champions, by the same principle which they have used for our annoyance. This I shall do in my next letter, promising that I shall lean very lightly upon them, unless I should see good cause for being more severe.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XX

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 22, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—In this letter, I shall lay before you a very few

facts, and refer to a few documents, for the purpose of showing how easily, if we were so disposed, we might treat the Churches of our opponents as they are in the habit of treating ours; and perhaps, unpleasant as the experiment is, we may find that carrying the war into their own dominions, would more speedily insure for us an honorable peace, and reduce to silence those who have no charitable disposition towards us. I shall begin with the religion of the file-leader of our opponents. Bishop Kemp states, that in spiritual concerns his religion is the same as that of the Church of England. Suppose I were to assert that the detestation of intolerance cannot exist in that Church under whose authority the Catholics were persecuted in the year 1826, and then produce the penal laws of the British government against Catholics, which laws the commons of Great Britain desired to have repealed, and the clergy petitioned to have continued, and which the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England exerted themselves successfully to keep in force. I would add to this, the fact, that Bishop Kemp and several other clergymen of this Church recommended to the American public a book published in England in the previous year, the object of which was to call upon the legislature of England to continue the persecution, and to justify its intolerance. Can the leader of our opponents make out against the Catholics a case like this? Did the French Catholic clergy petition their legislatures to withhold any of their rights from the French Protestants? Did the Archbishops and Bishops of France who are Catholics, vote against granting equal rights to their Protestant fellow subjects? Did they not vote in favor of such grants, and did they not give their consent to the paying of the Protestant clergy, and to granting in several instances to the Protestants Churches which had been built with the money of Catholics for Catholic worship: whilst in Ireland the Catholics are by force deprived of the Churches which their ancestors built, and which are capable of containing the thousands of Catholics, who are, for want of better accommodation, obliged to kneel in the fields, and in the streets outside their own buildings, which are far too small and too few for their numbers; whilst in the edifices from which they have been driven, sometimes a dozen, sometimes, perhaps, one hundred persons are seen scattered over an area in which they appear to be lost. In the Cathedrals of Dublin, which are the best attended, only that part which the Catholics used as the choir and sanctuary, are occupied by the Protestants, who have the present possession, and very frequently that portion is not half filled with the occupants of pews, and the vast aisles and transepts which were destined to accommodate the laity, are a gloomy desert, separated

from this diminished place of worship, whilst large buildings erected by the Catholics have a succession of masses from day-break till the afternoon, in order to afford the opportunity of successive attendance to seven or eight congregations, who are crowded together upon the floors, in the galleries, and the streets in the vicinity. Is it a spirit of toleration which deprives the Catholics of their Churches, the possession of which is a standing reproach to the unjust retainers?

Suppose I desired to be as unjust towards members of the associate Church and the reformed, as some of their ministers who sent forth Blanco White's book, were to us. I need only take their *Confession of Faith*, published in 1813, by Woodward, in Philadelphia, and copy therefrom "the solemn league and covenant" which is found in page 411—a very few extracts from which I shall give here.

They swear, "II. That we shall in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavor the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy, (that is, Church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, and commissaries, deans, deacons, and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers, depending on that hierarchy,) superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found to be contrary to sound doctrine and the power of Godliness, lest we partake in other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive their plagues; and that the Lord may be one, and his name one in the three kingdoms," (viz. England, Scotland and Ireland.)

In page 393, is found the national covenant (of Scotland) or the confession of faith, subscribed by the king in 1580, and by persons of all ranks in 1581, and again in 1590, and by barons, noblemen, gentlemen, burgesses, ministers and commoners in 1638, approved by the general assembly (general council) in 1639, and in that year signed again by persons of all ranks and qualities, and ratified by an act of parliament upon the supplication of the general assembly in the year 1640, and to which King Charles II was obliged to affix his signature at Scone, in 1650.

By this, all persons are required to profess and affirm, "before God and the whole world, that this only is the true Christian faith and religion, pleasing to God, and bringing salvation to man." It is also called "God's eternal truth, and only ground of our salvation."

From this document we may judge of the intolerance of those who penned and subscribed the confession of faith: take an extract.

"And therefore we abhor and detest all contrary religion and doctrine; but chiefly all kind of Papistry in general and particular heads, even as they are now damned and confuted by the word of God and kirk

of Scotland. But, in special, we detest and refuse the usurped authority of that Roman Antichrist upon the scriptures of God, upon the kirk, the civil magistrates, and consciences of men; all his tyrannous laws made upon indifferent things against our Christian liberty; his erroneous doctrine against the sufficiency of the written word, the perfection of the law, the office of Christ, and his blessed evangel; his corrupted doctrine concerning original sin, our natural inability and rebellion to God's law, our justification by faith only, our imperfect santification and obedience to the law; the nature, number, and use of the holy sacraments; his five bastard sacraments, with all his rites, ceremonies, and false doctrine, added to the ministration of the true sacraments without the word of God; his cruel judgment against infants departing without the sacrament; his absolute necessity of baptism; his blasphemous opinion of transubstantiation, or real presence of Christ's body in the elements, and receiving of the same by the wicked, or bodies of men; his dispensation with solemn oaths, perjuries, and degrees of marriage forbidden in the word; his cruelty against the innocent divorced; his devillish mass; his blasphemous priesthood; his profane sacrifice for sins of the dead and the quick; his canonization of men; calling upon angels or saints departed, worshipping of imagery, relics, and crosses; dedicating of kirks, altars, days; vows to creatures; his purgatory, prayers for the dead; praying or speaking in a strange language, with his processions and blasphemous litany, and multitude of advocates or mediators; his manifold orders; auricular confession; his desperate and uncertain repentance; his general and doubtsome faith; his satisfactions of men for their sins; his justification by works, *opus operatum*, works of supererogation, merits, pardons, peregrinations, and stations; his holy water, baptizing of bells, conjuring of spirits, crossing, sayning, anointing, conjuring, hallowing of God's good creatures, with the superstitious opinion joined therewith; his worldly monarchy, and wicked hierarchy; his three solemn vows, with all his shavellings of sundry sorts, his erroneous and bloody decrees made at Trent, with all the subscribers or approvers of that cruel and bloody band, conjured against the kirk of God. And finally, we detest all his vain allegories, rites, signs, and traditions brought in the kirk, without or against the word of God, and doctrine of this true reformed kirk; to the which we join ourselves willingly, in doctrine, faith, religion, discipline, and use of the holy sacraments, as lively members of the same in Christ our head: promising and swearing by the great name of the *Lord* our *God*, that we shall continue in the obedience of the doctrine and discipline of this kirk, and shall defend the same, according to our own vocation and

power, all the days of our lives; under the pains contained in the law, and danger both of body and soul in the day of God's fearful judgment.

"And seeing that many are stirred up by Satan, and that Roman Antichrist, to promise, swear, subscribe, and for a time use the holy sacraments in the kirk deceitfully, against their own conscience; minding hereby, first, under the external cloak of religion, to corrupt and subvert secretly God's true religion within the kirk; and afterward, when time may serve, to become open enemies and persecutors of the same, under vain hope of the Pope's dispensation, devised against the word of God, to his greater confusion, and their double condemnation in the day of the Lord Jesus: we therefore, willing to take away all suspicion of hypocrisy, and of such double dealing with God and his kirk, protest, and call the Searcher of all hearts for witness, that our minds and hearts do fully agree with this our confession, promise, oath, and subscription: so that we are not moved with any worldly respect, but are persuaded only in our conscience, through the knowledge and love of God's true religion imprinted in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, as we shall answer to him in the day when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed."

This extract not only contains such intolerance as I defy the associated assailants of our Church to produce a worse from any quarter; but it does more, for it makes false and calumnious charges upon the Roman Catholic Church. For instance, I would ask what were the bloody decrees made at Trent? And upon what do they ground the atrocious charge of hypocritical deceit in using the sacraments of the kirk against Catholics? And upon what do they found the charge of the Papal dispensations for hypocrisy, and deceit, and sacrilege?

The following extract will exhibit not only the spirit of the ecclesiastical body that drew up the *Confession of Faith*, but also the spirit of the legislature which enacted the laws therein recited; it is taken from the same *Confession of Faith.*

"Like as many acts of Parliament, not only in general do abrogate, annul, and rescind all laws, statutes, acts, constitutions, canons, civil or municipal, with all other ordinances, and practique penalties whatsoever, made in prejudice of the true religion, and professors thereof; or of the true kirk, discipline, jurisdiction, and freedom thereof; or in favor of idolatry and superstition, or of the Papistical kirk: As *Act* 3, 31, Parliament 1; *Act* 23, Parliament 11; *Act* 114, Parliament 11 of King James, VI. That papistry and superstition may be utterly suppressed, according to the intention of the Acts of Parliament, repeated in *Act* 5, Parliament 20, King James VI. And to that end they ordain

all Papists and Priests to be punished with manifold civil and ecclesiastical pains, as adversaries to God's true religion, preached, and by law established, within this realm, *Act* 24, Parliament 11, King James VI; as common enemies to all Christian government, *Act* 18, Parliament 16, King James VI; as rebellers and gainstanders of our sovereign Lord's authority, *Act* 47, Parliament 3, King James VI; and as idolaters, *Act* 104, Parliament 7, King James VI. But also, in particular, by and attour the *Confession of Faith*, do abolish and condemn the Pope's authority and jurisdiction out of this land, and ordains the maintainers thereof to be punished, *Act* 2, Parliament 1; *Act* 51, Parliament 3; *Act* 106, Parliament 7; *Act* 114, Parliament 12, King James VI, do condemn the Pope's erroneous doctrine, or any other erroneous doctrine repugnant to any of the articles of the true and Christian religion, publicly preached, and by law established in this realm; and ordains the spreaders and makers of books or libels, or letters or writs of that nature, to be punished, *Act* 46, Parliament 3; *Act* 106, Parliament 7; *Act* 24, Parliament 11, King James VI, do condemn all baptism conform to the Pope's kirk, and the idolatry of the mass; and ordains all sayers, wilful hearers, and concealers of the mass, the maintainers and resetters of the priests, Jesuits, trafficking Papists, to be punished without any exception or restriction, *Act* 5, Parliament 1; *Act* 120, Parliament 12; *Act* 164, Parliament 13; *Act* 193, Parliament 14; *Act* 1, Parliament 19; *Act* 5, Parliament 20, King James VI, do condemn all erroneous books and writs containing erroneous doctrine against the religion presently professed, or containing superstitious rites and ceremonies, Papistical, whereby the people are greatly abused, and ordains the home-bringers of them to be punished, *Act* 25, Parliament 11, King James VI, do condemn the monuments and dregs of bygone idolatry, as going to crosses, observing the festival days of saints, and such other superstitions and Papistical rites, to the dishonor of God, contempt of true religion, and fostering of great error among the people; and ordains the users of them to be punished for the second fault, as idolaters, *Act* 104, Parliament 7, King James VI."

The Presbyterian Church of the United States published their *Confession of Faith* in the year 1821. It was published in Philadelphia by Anthony Finley. In page 125, under the head "Of the Church," is the following:

Article II. "The visible Church, which is also Catholic or universal under the gospel, (not confined to one nation as before, under the law) consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of their Lord

Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."

Article V, page 127. "The purest Churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error: and some have so degenerated, as to become no Churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan."

Article VI. "There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that Anti-Christ, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church, against Christ, and all that is called God."

But this is still farther exhibited in chapter xxiv, page 121, "Of marriage and divorce." Section 2: "It is lawful for all sorts of people to marry who are able with judgment to give their consent, yet it is the duty of Christians to marry only in the Lord. And therefore such as profess the true reformed religion, should not marry with *Infidels, Papists, or other Idolaters*: neither should such as are godly, be unequally yoked, by marrying with such as are notoriously wicked in their life, or maintain damnable heresies."

I shall follow up this no longer. For the present, I shall only add, that before these good gentlemen charged us with intolerance, they ought to have looked at home, to see how their own standard works spoke.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXI

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 29, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends—I have given in my last letter a very short and imperfect exhibition of the grounds upon which I might retort the charge of "Intolerance," with a direful effect upon the principal assailants of our Church, in their recommendation of the Reverend Joseph Blanco White, A.M., and so forth.

The writer, in the passage which I have reviewed, incidentally treats of "Infallibility;" but, as a more appropriate occasion will offer hereafter for the examination of this topic, I shall now dismiss with two observations the whole of what is raised as an implied dilemma. It is found in page 64 of the *Evidence*:

"If the Roman Catholic Church can thus allow detestable dogmas to act in full force within the inmost recesses of her bosom, those Catholics who differ from her notions, so far as her apologist, Mr. Butler, might guide themselves in religious matters, without the assistance of her infallibility."

This means that "religious intolerance" by which is meant an injunction to persecute because of religious error, is a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church, and consequently taught to Roman Catholics, as a portion of their doctrine, by her infallible tribunal. The supposition is a glaring assumption of what is untrue. The infallible tribunal of the Roman Catholic Church teaches no such dogma. It has indeed, been laid down by her opponents as the principle by which they themselves were guided. It is to be found expressly embodied in their confessions of faith; but I defy them to show it taught by our Church, as a dogma. Even the miserable man White himself dare not assert that it is a dogma of our Church; for his expression is sufficiently guarded to avoid the direct charge, and sufficiently framed to imply it, and thus to make a false impression upon the general reader. He only charges that she allows detestable dogmas to act with full force, and so forth,—he does not charge that she teaches,—and nothing is a doctrine of her's which she does not teach.

Thus, he had also but one dogma under consideration; and with the same species of dishonesty, and equal want of candor, of logic, and of truth, he shifts to the plural, detestable dogmas. A writer of this description in religious inquiry ought to be avoided as you would a detected swindler in your pecuniary transactions. Do you, or can you, imagine a more dangerous being, than one who knowingly and dishonestly quibbles with you, deceives you, and misleads you in your anxious inquiry for the salvation of your soul? The miserable man who, urged by want, dishonestly tricks you into the loss of a few dollars, is dragged before the public tribunal of the country, is exposed to official and general reproach, and bears about him through the world the indelible mark of deserved infamy; but what ought to be the fate of him who, by juggling falsehood, endeavors to decoy his fellow-beings from the service of their Creator?

Not only, then, is the Roman Catholic not taught by his Church, as a doctrine, or as a principle, that he ought to persecute his neighbor for his religious errors, but he is taught to love his neighbor as himself, for the love of God; he is taught that they who differ from him in religion are his neighbors; and we saw that even White acknowledged, page 65, that Rome did not persecute for error. Then the Roman Catholic Church does not persecute for error, does not teach persecution; consequently, the detestable dogma of religious intolerance is not taught by her infallible tribunal; consequently the rejection of this dogma was not in opposition to that tribunal, nor incompatible with its

decisions. What then is the value of White's dilemmas? Perhaps Bishop Kemp can inform you, for I cannot.

I now proceed to another extract, which is the passage succeeding the one last examined:

"The Roman Catholics have been accused of holding a doctrine which justifies them in not keeping faith with heretics. This charge is false as it stands; but it has a foundation in truth, which I will lay before you, as an important consequence of the claims of your Church to infallibility. The constant intercourse with those whom you call heretics has blunted the feeling of horror, which the Roman Church has assiduously fomented against Christians who dissent from her. It is, indeed, a happy result of the Reformation, that some of the strongest prejudices of the Roman Catholics have been softened, wherever the Protestant religion has obtained a footing. Where this mixture has never taken place, true Roman Catholics remain nearly what they were in the time when Christendom rejoiced at the breach of faith which committed Huss to the flames, by the sentence of a general council. In England, however, far from pretending to such advantages, the Roman Catholics resented the suspicion that their oaths, not to interfere with the Protestant establishment, may be annulled by the Pope. The settled and sincere determination to keep such oaths, in those who appeared ready to take them, I will not question for a moment; but I cannot conceal my persuasion, that it is the duty of every Roman Catholic pastor to dissuade the members of his flock from taking oaths which, if not allowed in a spirit of the most treacherous policy, would imply a separation from the communion of the Church of Rome. Let me lay down the doctrine of that Church on this important point."

It certainly is a very novel mode of proving a charge, by commencing with a declaration that it is false, and then proceeding to prove that it has a foundation in truth; yet such is Mr. White's exhibition of himself! Did his American sponsors undertake to carry him through this difficulty? Do they charge upon their fellow-citizens the horrid crime here imputed to the great bulk of Christendom, of which the Roman Catholics of this Union form a portion? Is it possible that they impute to the venerable survivor of that patriot band, which gave liberty and power to our glorious republic, that there is a true foundation for the charge, that he would not keep faith with heretics? Was there a foundation of truth for the charge, that Lafayette, Rochambeau, Pulaski, De Grasse, and so many other Roman Catholics did not keep faith with heretics? Was Arnold a Roman Catholic? Did the Pennsylvania line, which was eminently Catholic, keep faith with heretics? Did Louis

XVI keep faith with heretics? My friends, there is a point at which the mind almost loses its power of argument, and indignation becomes a virtue. Who would stoop to argument with a seducer? Who would dispute upon the impropriety of defamation? Who would endeavor to convince a calumniator? There was a time when the gross multitude of ignorant Englishmen was duped by the knavery of an unprincipled court, which deluded one portion of its subjects, that it might be enabled to grind down other nations, and thus play the tyrant over a divided and debased population; but when that court made its essay at this side of the Atlantic, young America rose in the vigor of her intellect, the power of her strength, and the pride of her independence; and, with the aid of a Catholic nation, broke a tyrant's sceptre, and placed her foot upon his crown; whilst the delighted eagle of her Appalachian hills played around her head, leaving in his track the halo of her glory and of his joy; and shall the American mind at this day be enthralled by the calumnious influence of the British court? Shall our country, whilst she ranks high amidst the nations of the earth, still be debased by her children, in being made the receptacle of the vilest libels of the most persecuting court in Christendom? Is this the liberality of our clergy? Is this the learning of our ministers of religion? Is this the independence of our spirit? Is this the affection of our fellow-citizens? Is this the honor of America, that, when even Hodge declares that the Pope of Rome has neither tail nor horns; when, from John O'Groat's house to the cliffs of Dover, it is avowed that he is not a scarlet lady; when a starving population proclaims that it has been deceived by a bloated clergy, and robbed and degraded by an oppressive government? Is this the honor of America, that at such a time as this, when a Catholic people is told by a profligate prince, who has been publicly convicted before the parliament of his country, of making the highest offices of the nation the price of his paramours' crimes, that as God shall help him they shall be kept in bondage, the clergy of the Protestant Churches of America should combine to fling upon their Catholic fellow-citizens the dregs of the calumnies which have emanated from such a source, and give to the American people the offal, which the very rabble of Great Britain has rejected? For shame! That our country should have so low a place, as that Bishop Kemp and his associates have no other mode of assailing us, save the fragments of those poisonous arrows, which they collect from the fields in which their discomfited brethren have fallen in Europe! And must I, need I, exhibit the absurd and contradictory statement thus taken up. The charge is false, as it stands, but it has a foundation in truth! ! !

If it be true that Catholic prejudice has been softened, by an intercourse with Protestants, I lament much that the prelate and his associates have not hearts equally susceptible; for, indeed, it is out of my power to return Blanco White's compliment in their favor.

The same bad spirit, which pervades the entire publication, is apparent in this passage; the same spirit of falsehood prevails. (1). It is not true that Christendom rejoiced at the breach of faith which committed Huss to the flames. (2). It is not true that Huss was committed to the flames by the sentence of a general council. (3). It is not true that any breach of faith was committed by any person in the case of the burning of the unfortunate man, who fell the victim of his own delusion.

As the refutation of every distinct falsehood contained in the production of our opponents, would lead to almost the labor of a life, and as those have been often before refuted, and as often repeated without proof, I shall content myself with placing my denial upon record, and declaring that when either of our assailants shall think proper to attempt the proof of either of the propositions which I have denied, I shall meet him with its refutation.

The conclusion of this passage of White's contains the most atrocious charge upon us: let us therefore see the reasoning:

"I will assume the most liberal opinion of the Catholic divines, and grant that the Pope cannot annul an oath in virtue of his dispensing power. [12] But this can only be said of a lawful oath; a quality which no human law can confer upon an engagement to perform a sinful act. A promise under oath, to execute an immoral deed, is in itself a monstrous offence against the divine law; and the performance of such a promise would only aggravate the crime of having made it. There are, however, cases where the lawfulness of the engagement is doubtful, and the obligation burthensome, or, by a change of circumstances, inexpedient and preposterous. The interference of the Pope, in such cases, is, according to the liberal opinion I am stating, improperly called dispensation. The Pope only declares that the original oath or vow was null and void, either from the nature of the thing promised, or from some circumstances in the manner and form of the promise; when, by virtue of his

[12] Thomas Aquinas, whose authority is most highly reverenced in these matters, maintains, however, that there exists a power in the Church to dispense both with a vow, which, according to him, is the most sacred of all engagements, and consequently, with an oath. *Sicut in voto aliqua necessitatis seu honestatis causa potest fieri dispensatio, ita et in Juramento. Secunda Secundae,* Quæst. lxxxix, art. ix. The Popes, in fact, have frequently exercised this dispensing power with the tacit consent of the Church.

authority, the head of the Church removes all spiritual responsibility from the person who submits himself to his decision. I do not consider myself bound to confirm the accuracy of this statement, by written authorities, as I do not conceive the possibility of any Roman Catholic divine bringing it into question."

It is very extraordinary that this man should impute to us a doctrine which we do not hold, and then state that it is impossible for us to deny that the doctrine is ours, and therefore he need not prove that we hold it. I have now extended this letter too far to allow me to disprove this charge, but I deny that he has correctly stated our tenet, and must reserve my further remarks for my next.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 5, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I proceed to examine the grounds upon which White rests his monstrous charge that there is no dependence to be placed upon the oaths of Roman Catholics to a Protestant government: the passage which contains his argument upon this head, has been laid before you in my last letter. Let us, however, see the true state of the question, by considering the special case which gave rise to White's remarks.

Roman Catholics believe that their Protestant brethren have departed from the true doctrines of our Saviour: in Great Britain, King Henry VIII, the guardians of Edward VI, and Queen Elizabeth, made the Parliaments deprive the Roman Catholics of that property and of those establishments which had been given to their Church by their predecessors of the same faith: a considerable portion of this property was given by the crown, in bribes to those who were principally influential in sanctioning the plunder; and the remainder was given to form an establishment for a new church modeled upon the form which pleased the plunderers. It is time for us, my friends, to call these people by their true names; no person could attempt to do so, whilst our republics were colonies of Britain; custom perpetuated the appellation which power originally insisted upon: America still was the suckling of England in literature; but she has been weaned; and her mental independence makes rapid progress: her children will upon examination acknowledge that I have given to the courtiers of Henry, of Edward, and of Elizabeth, their appropriate appellation.

The British State thus linked to a Church of its own creation, commenced a most atrocious persecution against the adherents of the old religion; the annals of the world exhibit no parallel to the frightful code and its protracted execution. By the most unnatural and ruinous system of taxation, the British empire achieved the most prominent situation in the world: and her pride and her cruelty equalled her prosperity. She met her first reverse when she unconstitutionally attempted to make her American colonies share in the payment of her wanton expenses: wounded by the talons of our young eagle, she sought to conciliate the wretched Catholics whom she had so severely smitten; but when the conscious criminal found herself under the necessity of mitigating her tortures, she felt how unseemly her conduct must appear unless there was some pretext for the relaxation. She had previously, to attempt a justification of her misconduct, charged upon her victims crimes of which she had herself created the semblance, that she might impute to them the reality; she now required of them to disavow tenets which they never held, that upon the ground of the disavowal she might rest at once her present concession and the palliation of her former injustice. Thus the misfortune of the British nation was the cause of the first mitigation of her barbarous code in 1778, as the dangerous state of Scotland and of England in 1745, was the cause of the first relaxation of the Irish government in its execution of statutes which depopulated one half the kingdom and barbarized the other half; because in a state of active persecution the torturer and the tortured are equally made ferocious. When in 1793, the convulsions of France, shook Europe to its center, Ireland trembled and Britain felt the vibration; more concession was found to be absolutely necessary. The Catholic Universities had been seriously asked the most insulting questions, and upon their declarations that the religion of Christendom was not a tissue of blasphemy and execrable crime, and also upon requiring the Catholics to swear that they would not take away the plunder from the Church of the State to give it to their own Church, and that they would not seek for a restitution of the lands of which their families had been robbed because they would not join the Church of the State, they received farther concessions.

Since that period, thirty-four years had elapsed; an entire generation had passed away: and no semblance of a charge could be made against that generation for having deviated from the spirit or the letter of that oath. An immense portion of this persecuting code still afflicts the present generation: though they have by the British House of Commons been repeatedly declared worthy of the full restitution of their

rights: the present King, Lords and Commons have solemnly declared by more than one act of the legislature, that the crimes imputed to their fathers, and upon the supposed existence of which, several of those persecuting laws were enacted, were base fabrications supported only by the flagrant perjury, in several instances, of a clergyman of the established Church, and of his equally criminal associates. The present generation complains that notwithstanding their blood and treasure having been profusely lavished in the cause of their persecuting government, and their willingness to abide by their oaths as their fathers have done, still they are degraded and afflicted: the House of Commons votes their relief, and a large portion of the Peers are known to be favorable to the great principle of civil and religious liberty; the great dignitaries of the established Church whisper to their friends and dependents, that if the Catholics are restored to their rights, they will be stripped of those possessions which were originally taken from the Catholics, and therefore, they must oppose the concession of their rights to a persecuted people. Call you this the spirit of the Gospel? Is this the characteristic of apostles? Are these the followers of him who sent without scrip or purse those men to whom they claim succession? But mark the means which are used in addition. White, an apostate Spanish priest, a man whom I shall yet prove from his own book not to be in the doctrinal communion of that English Church, is employed to publish a gross libel to defame the Catholics, and to assert amongst other falsehoods, that this oath which they tendered, taken and observed, is no security: that according to the most liberal opinion of Catholic divines, the promissory oath of a Roman Catholic is no guarantee for his performance. The Irish Catholics have given such an answer to this charge when it was made by men more worthy of notice than White, as ought to have caused their calumniators to be forever silent. "Produce to us," say they, "a single instance in which we violated our oaths or our engagements to you. We charge you with having violated the law of nations in our regard, we charge you with having induced the British King William III, to forfeit the sacred faith of plighted majesty; we charge you with having induced the privy council to violate their oaths of office; we charge you with the most disgraceful and flagrant violation of a solemn treaty made at the walls of Limerick. Upon your pledged faith we laid down our arms, and you enslaved us; we confided in your honor, and you betrayed us; we knelt before our altars to adore our God, and you who swore to permit us to do so without molestation, dragged us from the holy place in chains; seized upon our buildings, confiscated our inheritance, thrust us into your dungeons, murdered thousands, and

made millions hewers of wood and drawers of water: you have taunted us in our afflicting degradation; you have violated your own oaths! and misrepresented us to the world; you sent us to every foreign shore with contumely, and you charge us with not being worthy of credit on our oaths! How well it becomes you to make the charge! Do you judge of us by yourselves? We spurn the comparison. Though you may bend our bodies, you cannot debase our souls; our honor is untarnished, our faith is preserved, our promises are fulfilled, our oaths are unviolated: wipe from yourselves the disgrace of your ancestors: talk not of oaths, until you do us justice." Such is the answer of the Irish Catholic to the British Churchman.

But the most extraordinary part of the whole case remains. A number of American Protestant Clergymen of contradictory denominations unite under the leadership of a Bishop of a Church which sprung from that created in England, to reprint in America White's calumny against the British Catholics! What can be their object? That of the people in England was palpable. Was the object of the American Clergy the same? To prevent Catholic emancipation; to try whether they could by telling their flocks that British Catholics were not credible on their oaths, cool down that generous ardor which led the American Protestant and Catholic to associate in the cause of suffering Ireland and in the cause of suffering Greece? Could it be possible that this was the object of Bishop Kemp and his associates? I hope not. I should be sorry to think that so many men, holding such stations in our republics, should have formed a holy alliance against the great principle of civil and religious liberty. But what is the alternative? If the object was not to charge the criminal principle solely upon the British Catholics, for the nefarious purpose of continuing their debasement, it must be, as they say themselves, to exhibit the true principles of the Catholic religion; thus they make the charge upon every American Catholic, and upon every Catholic in the world; that is, upon nearly two hundred millions of the most civilized portion of the human race! ! ! And for this purpose they adopt the atrocious and miserable sophistry and falsehood of White. Let us examine its value.

He sets out with a statement that it is the most liberal opinion of Catholic divines that the Pope cannot annul an oath in virtue of his dispensing power. As most of this man's deceit consists in the ambiguity of his phrases, I must be rather tedious in their examination. In this place it is right to have an accurate notion of what is the meaning of the Pope's dispensing power. I have known persons to assert that it

was a doctrine of our Church that the Pope could dispense with the observance of the law of God.

A dispensing power pre-supposes an obligatory power, because a power of dispensing means power to release from an obligation. We must then know what is the power which binds, before we can know properly what is the power which can release. Man is a creature dependent upon God who is his supreme ruler and legislator; this legislator has bound man to the observance of certain great principles, which are discoverable by the natural exercise of his reason, and the collection of those principles, is called the natural law: the same legislator has also by means of revelation, given certain precepts for man's conduct, the collection of those precepts is called the divine law. The natural law and the divine law emanating from the God of truth and immutability, must be consistent and changeable. A universally acknowledged maxim of law is, that no power inferior to that which made a law can repeal it, or dispense with its observance; but the power which enacted may repeal its own act, or may restrict its force by exempting certain individuals or communities from its operation. It is also acknowledged that the legislator who makes a general law, can depute to an individual, or to a community, a power in certain cases, of dispensing with its observance; and the dispensation will in this case be equally valid as was the original enactment: in such a case, it is not required that the power of the deputy should be equal to the power of the legislator, because in fact his delegated power is not his own, but that of his principal, who is the legislator. Thus the governors of several of our States, who certainly have not the power of legislation, dispense, in several instances, by the authority of the State or its legislature, with the execution of several criminal laws of the State. If the people had power to dispense with observance of the natural law, or of the divine law, it must be in virtue of a special delegation for that purpose given by God: which delegation should be fully proved.

Besides the natural and divine law, man is bound by the laws of society, that is, by the law of nations, or that collection of general principles which all civilized societies have agreed upon as the basis for their intercourse, and by the laws of that particular nation in which the individual resides. The delegation of the nations which form society is necessary to be exhibited as the ground for a valid dispensation from the law of nations, and the delegation of the particular nation must also precede the power to dispense in any one of its enactments: the same principle is of equal force through all lawful associations down to the humblest club of mutual aid.

The Church is a society established by God himself for spiritual purposes. Roman Catholics believe that the great Creator of this body did not form or sanction the formation of conflicting ecclesiastical bodies, but made his Church one in her government and doctrines. They believe, that this single society has received from God for its constitution, first, the natural law, secondly, the divine negative law; that is, a collection of ordinances by God, in which he forbids at all times and under all circumstances the doing of certain acts: they believe that he did not leave to the Church the power of repealing or dispensing in any portion of either of those sections of its constitution. They further believe that, thirdly, he gave certain positive ordinances, or laws [commanding] to do certain acts, which were never to be omitted altogether, but that he left to the Church the power of enacting, according to circumstances of time and place, when and how those duties were to be performed. Such was that of observing the Sabbath as a holy day, which obligation the Church has subsequently transferred to the Lord's day—such also was the precept of fasting, but the designation of the special time and manner he left to the Church: fourthly, that he gave to this Church a form of government, which it had no authority to change, and that this government received from him legislative, judicial and executive powers; [also that] as the Church was one body, he constituted a president who was to be the principal judge, and the supreme administrator of this society, who was to have certain inalienable rights and powers. This supreme head is the Pope, and his power of dispensation, upon legal principles, cannot reach to the constitution of the Church; thus he cannot dispense in any obligation of the natural law, nor in any obligation of the divine negative law; for instance, he cannot make it lawful for a child to injune a parent, or for a parent to abandon his child; nor can he make murder innocent, or a lie guiltless; neither can he dispense with the divine positive law, so as to exempt a person continually from its operation, though he has power to dispense for sufficient cause, with the positive enactment of the Church, regulating the time and manner; for instance of that public worship which God has commanded, or of that fasting or mortification which he generally established; nor can he dispense with or change that form of Church government which is of divine institution; hence, properly speaking, the Pope has power only, upon sufficient grounds to grant a dispensation from the observance of the general ecclesiastical laws; but not from the observance of the natural law, or of the divine law.

Having thus ascertained the nature of the Pope's dispensing power, we proceed to ascertain by what law is an oath binding. A promissory

oath is a promise made with a solemn adjuration of God to do some act, or to avoid some act. The divine negative law decrees:—"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."—Hence the divine negative law binds to the performance, and the power of dispensing therein resides in God alone, unless he has granted a delegated power to another; and of that delegation, there must be sufficient evidence. But as White now says St. Thomas asserts that there exists in the Church a power of dispensing with vows, which are solemn promises made to God, and with oaths which are the next in solemnity, as being adjurations of God; it becomes necessary to examine farther.

God left in his Church judicial power, that is, a power of deciding as well what were general principles of the law which he gave, as also what were the particular cases to which they were applicable. In the tribunal the general decision is made, that a promissory oath binds under pain of damnation to the performance of the promise. I shall now adduce a special case. A person has vowed or sworn to pay yearly during his life a certain sum of money towards the propagation of the Christian Religion in a heathen country: the oath was the sanction of a lawful promise to do a meritorious act; he is evidently bound to its performance. Years elapse, his means are diminished, his friends are impoverished, and his parents are cast upon his bounty for their subsistence; yet he has the means of supplying his own wants and of observing his oath; but by so doing he must neglect his parents; and if he gives the usual contribution for the propagation of the Gospel, his wretched family will perish through want: he applies to the tribunal to know whether he is still bound to fulfill his vow or to observe his oath, that vow and oath which were originally lawful, and meritorious, and binding. I do not treat of an unlawful oath, or of a sinful oath which never could create any bond or obligation. The tribunal of the Church will tell him to observe the natural law, and the law of charity, which bind him to support his parents, and by the power which God left of binding and loosing, will now loose him from the oath or vow, and dispense with an observance which though originally meritorious, would now be a violation of the supreme law of nature, of the best law of charity.

The oath or vow here was originally good and binding, yet White asserts in page 68, that in such a case "The Pope only declares the original oath or vow was null and void." And this is the theologian whom Bishop Kemp and his associates hold forward as eminently qualified to tell the Protestants of America, what are the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church!!! Do those good men themselves know our

doctrines? If they do, why misrepresent them? If they do not, why presume to testify upon a subject concerning which they are ignorant? White concludes his assertion of this false imputation, in the manner which is usually characteristic of that arrogance which undertakes to make tenets for our Church without studying our authors. "I do not consider myself bound to confirm the accuracy of this statement by written authorities, as I do not conceive the possibility of any Roman Catholic divine bringing it into question."

So it is; the mere assertion of the most puny and unprincipled libeller of our Church is to pass current as proof; and he need never produce evidence of the correctness of his statements; all our declarations, documents and writers, are of no avail against the simple calumny of our accuser. Whether America will in this respect follow the example of Europe, remains yet to be seen. White continues,

"The Roman Catholic doctrine on the obligation of oaths being clearly understood, sincere members of that Church can find no difficulty in applying it to any existing test, or to any oath which may be tendered, in future, with a view to define the limits of their opposition to doctrines and practices condemned by Rome. In the first place, they cannot but see that an oath binding them to lend a direct support to any Protestant establishment, or to omit such measures as may, without finally injuring the cause of catholicism, check and disturb the spread and ascendancy of error; is in itself sinful and cannot, therefore, be obligatory. In the second place it must be evident that if, for the advantage of the Catholic religion suffering under an heterodox ascendancy, some oaths of this kind may be tolerated by Catholic divines, the head of that Church will find it his duty, to declare their nullity upon any change of circumstances. The persevering silence of the papal see in regard to this point, notwithstanding the advantages which an authorized declaration would give to the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, is an indubitable proof that the Pope cannot give his sanction to engagements made in favor of a Protestant establishment. Of this, Bossuet himself was aware, when to his guarded opinion upon the scruples of James II against the coronation oath, he subjoined the salvo:—"I nevertheless submit with all my heart to the supreme decision of his Holiness." If that decision, however, was then, and is now, withheld, notwithstanding the disadvantages to which the silence of Rome subjects the Roman Catholics it cannot be supposed that it would at all tend to remove them. To such as are intimately acquainted with the Catholic doctrines, which I have just laid before you, the conduct of the Roman see is in no way mysterious."

Of course my friends you perceive that this whole sentence is built upon a false supposition, namely, that he did clearly lay down our doctrine on the obligation of oaths. In the next place he states a distinct falsehood, viz. that the oath which Roman Catholics in Great Britain take, not to use their political power to disturb the Protestant establishment for the purpose of substituting a Roman Catholic establishment in its stead, is an oath binding them to lend direct support to the Protestant establishment. It is no such oath; it is only a covenant made as a condition upon which they seek to be admitted to their rights, that they will not reclaim for their own Church the plunder which the Protestant holds; in other words, it is a relinquishment of any claim to restitution, it is compounding for a part of their rights. Such a composition is not sinful; it is not more criminal than it was for a friend of mine in Ireland to compound for a portion of his property when the whole was in danger. Bishop Kemp might love to learn the facts. Two first cousins well known in one of the southern counties were Roman Catholics in the year 1790, and had good estates; one of them squandered and the other improved; the spendthrift, finding his property vanished, went to the Protestant Church and abjured the errors of Popery, and was thenceforth known by the appellation of "Protestant Tom." The industrious cousin, "Catholic Tom," received notice that a bill was filed against him, *in equity*, by his good cousin discovering against him, for that he being a Papist held a landed estate, value three thousand pounds sterling yearly, which estate was claimed by "Protestant Tom" as having duly conformed to the Church by law established, and being therefore legally entitled to the same. It is by means of such bills of discovery, the Irish Catholics have been impoverished and sent as conscientious and impoverished exiles into every region of the earth. "Catholic Tom" had no valid plea, in bar of his cousin's claim, because he really was a Catholic and had the land: he however called upon his goodly cousin, and compounded with him by selling him half his estate, for sixpence, and thus procuring the bill of discovery to be taken off the file of the equitable Chancellor of Ireland. I have seen and known both; "Protestant Tom" I knew to be a most loyal subject, a most zealous member of the Bible distribution, [who] had his sons duly educated in the principles of the Church by law established, and provided with commissions in his majesty's army and navy, whilst his cousin sometimes fills the chair at the aggregate meeting of his county, and sees his sons toiling through the labors of a profession, or cultivating the remnant of his patrimony. Was it a sinful act in him to make this composition? As little sin is there in the Catholic body swearing that they will relinquish to the

Protestant Church, that establishment which it already possesses. It is lawful to relinquish one part of your rights to secure the remainder: when you by an oath engage yourself to the performance of a lawful act, your oath is binding and valid; though no previous claim bound, the oath now binds him who takes it, though it can make no good title for him who exacts it, and no tribunal, Papal or other, can declare that what is originally valid, was originally invalid. It is also untrue to assert, as White here does, that Rome has been silent on this topic: for the oath in which this clause is contained, has been repeatedly examined, and approved of at Rome. I shall add but one more remark. This oath is a bond or pledge to a solemn contract made by the authority of the State, in which the dominion of property exists; such a contract involves the rights of both parties, the release of one would be an injustice to the other, without the free consent of this other party, or that of the State was given: this is a prineiple of natural law, in which the Pope has no dispensing power: henee, where a lawful contract is made, and confirmed by an oath, no tribunal has the power of dispensing with that oath, for this dispensation would involve the violation of the contract.

How many falsehoods, and how much gross ignorance of theological principles are contained in this passage, which asserts that no reliance is to be placed upon the oaths of Catholics? Does not Bishop Kemp know, and do not his associates know, that the insulted Irish and British Catholics need only commit one perjury, and get absolution from Rome, and they would be upon an equal footing with their Protestant fellow-citizens? But because they value their oaths, and Rome has no such absolutions or dispensations to give; they still are under the thraldom of Protestant persecution, in violation of a solemn treaty ratified by Protestant oaths on earth, and by the adjuration of Heaven above, by the Protestant monarch, who pledged himself to observe this violated contract.

Good God! what will Europe say of our liberality, when she shall hear that a congregation of Protestant Clergymen, with a Bishop at their head, charge the Roman Catholics of the United States with holding the most detestable doctrine, and with being unworthy of credit on their solemn oaths? When she shall find them advocating the violation of the treaty of Limerick, and calumniating the persecuted British and Irish Catholics?

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXIII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 13, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—Having shown that we have been grossly misrepresented by White in his charge of our disregard of oaths: having also shown how flagrantly the solemn oaths of stipulations and contracts with the Irish Catholics were violated by the British Protestants; I shall add only one fact, to which I challenge Bishop Kemp and his associates to find me a parallel. Doctor Dopping, the Protestant Bishop of Meath, in Ireland, preached publicly from the pulpit of a Protestant Church in Dublin, that no treaty of Protestants favorable to Catholics was binding or ought to be observed. It is true that some of his brethren dissented from this doctrine, but it is equally true that the King of England, the head of his Church, followed the Bishop of Meath's principle in practice: it is equally true that the Irish parliament has done likewise; not only has this sermon been practically observed by William and Mary, the supreme head in earth of the English Protestant Church, but also of their successors in the same headship, viz. Anne, George I, George II, George III, and his present sacred majesty George IV, supreme head on earth of the Churches of England and Ireland. Also by their several privy councils, also by the British parliament, since the union; which councils and parliaments were all Protestant, and were and are, in fact, the supreme governing power of the English Protestant Church.

I shall conclude this topic with inserting the following documents:

Extract from the declaration of the Catholic Bishops in Great Britain, in the year 1826.

Section VII. *On the Obligation of an Oath.*

"Catholics are charged with holding that they are not bound by any oath, and that the Pope can dispense them from all the oaths they may have taken.

"We cannot sufficiently express our astonishment at such a charge. We hold that the obligation of an oath is most sacred: for by an oath man calls the Almighty searcher of hearts to witness the sincerity of his conviction of the truth of what he asserts; and his fidelity in performing the engagement he makes. Hence, whoever swears falsely, or violates the lawful engagement he has confirmed by an oath, not only offends against truth, or justice, but against religion. He is guilty of the enormous crime of perjury.

"No power in any Pope, or council, or in any individual or body

of men, invested with authority in the Catholic Church, can make it lawful for a Catholic to confirm any falsehood by an oath; or dispense with any oath by which a Catholic has confirmed his duty of allegiance to his sovereign, or any obligation of duty or justice to a third person. He who takes an oath is bound to observe it, in the obvious meaning of the words, or in the known meaning of the person to whom it is sworn."

Extract from the "True Principles of Catholics," published in 1826, *by the Liverpool Catholic Defence Society, being the repetition of what has been frequently established by the British Catholics.*

Sixth. "Catholics believe that in order to enter into eternal life, we must keep the commandments of God, and that, with his grace, they can be kept: 'And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.' (*St. Luke*, i, 6). And that whosoever dies under the guilt of a wilful breach of any one of these divine precepts, will be eternally lost. That no power on earth can grant any man leave to break the least commandment of God, or commit a sin of what kind soever, or to do evil with an intent that good may proceed from it. That neither the Pope, nor any man living, can dispense with the laws of God, or make it lawful for any one to lie, to forswear himself, or do any thing whatsoever that is forbidden by the divine law."

Extract from a series of curses to which every Catholic is prepared to answer "Amen," repeatedly published by the English Catholic divines in answer to their Protestant calumniators.

"Cursed is he who believes that the Pope can give to any, upon any occasion whatsoever, dispensations to lie or swear falsely; or that it is lawful for any, at the last hour, to protest himself innocent in case he be guilty. Catholic, *Amen.*"

"Cursed is he who teaches that it is lawful to do a wicked thing, though it be for the interest and good of the Mother-Church; or that any evil action may be done, that good may ensue from it. Catholic, *Amen.*"

"Cursed be all Catholics who teach or believe that infamous doctrine called Popery, as Protestants understand it; and cursed may we be, if we do not detest all those hellish practises and doctrines which they force on us. Catholic, *Amen.*"

"Cursed be all Catholics who will not obey the lawful commands

of all Protestant authorities,[13] or who will not fulfil their duty, in every respect, to their lawful Protestant king and country. Catholic, *Amen.*"

"Cursed be all Catholics, if in answering or saying Amen to any of these curses, they use any equivocations or mental reservations, or do not assent to them in the common and obvious sense of the words. Catholic, *Amen, Amen.*"

To these is appended the following note in the publication of the above named society:

These principles have been a thousand times attacked, and a thousand times proved to be our true principles, to the full satisfaction of thousands of well disposed Protestants, many of whom, in their last moments, were reconciled to the Catholic Church; and in our days, nothing is more common, than such like reconciliations, particularly in London, Manchester, and Liverpool. Now, we defy our adversaries to prove one solitary instance of a Roman Catholic, who, in his last moments, called for a clergyman of any other persuasion than that of his own. Bishop Porteus failed in the attempt, when challenged to do so, by the Right Reverend Dr. Milner, a Roman Catholic Bishop.

A warning to Protestants: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy (Catholic) neighbor." Eighth Commandment.

An extract from an exhortation of the Roman Catholic clergy of Dublin, read from their altars on the 3d of October, 1757.[14]

"We are no less zealous than ever in exhorting you to abstain from cursing, swearing and blaspheming: detestable vices, to which the poorer sort of our people are most unhappily addicted, and which must at one time or other bring down the vengeance of heaven upon you in some visible punishment, unless you absolutely refrain from them.

"It is probable, that, from hence, some people have taken occasion to brand us with this infamous calumny, that we need not fear to take false oaths, and consequently to perjure ourselves; as if we believed that any power upon earth could authorize such damnable practices, or grant dispensations for this purpose. How unjust and cruel this charge is, you know by our instructions to you both in public and private, in which we have ever condemned such doctrines as false and impious. Others, likewise, may easily know it from the constant behaviour of numbers of Roman Catholics, who have given the strongest

[13] Spiritual matters excepted.
[14] From the *Dublin Journal* of Oct. 4, 1757.

proofs of their abhorrence of those tenets, by refusing to take oaths, which, however conducive to their temporal interest, appeared to them entirely repugnant to the principles of their religion.

"To conclude, be just in your dealings, sober in your conduct, religious in your practice, avoid riots, quarrels, and tumults; and thus you will approve yourselves good citizens, peaceable subjects, and pious Christians."

The Catholic's Test of Allegiance prescribed by the 13th and 14th, Geo. III, chapter xxxv.

I, A B, do take Almighty God and his only Son Jesus Christ my Redeemer, to witness, that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to our most gracious sovereign lord, King George the Third, and him defend to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatever, that shall be made against his person, crown and dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavor to disclose and make known to his majesty, and his heirs, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies, which may be formed against him or them; and I do faithfully promise to maintain, support and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown in his majesty's family, against any person or persons whatsoever, hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto the person taking upon himself the style and title of Prince of Wales, in the lifetime of his father, and who, since his death, is said to have assumed the style and title of King of Great Britain and Ireland, by the name of Charles the Third, and to any person claiming or pretending a right to the crown of these realms; and I do swear, that I do reject and detest as unchristian and impious to believe, that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for or under pretence of their being heretics; and also that unchristian and impious principle, that no faith is to be kept with heretics; I further declare, that it is no article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that princes excommunicated by the Pope and council, or by any authority of the See of Rome, or by any authority whatsoever, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever; and I do promise, that I will not hold, maintain, or abet, any such opinion, or any other opinion, contrary to what is expressed in this declaration; and I do declare, that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm; and I do solemnly, in the presence of God, and his only Son, Jesus Christ, my Redeemer,

profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever, and without and dispensation already granted by the Pope or authority of the See of Rome, or any other person whatever; and without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons, or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning. *So help me God.*"

QUERIES TO FOREIGN UNIVERSITIES, WITH THEIR ANSWERS.

"When the committee of the English Catholics (for they had a committee with whom the English ministers of the crown did not disdain to communicate) waited on Mr. Pitt, he requested to be furnished with authentic evidence of the opinions of the Catholic clergy, and the Catholic universities abroad, "with respect to the existence and extent of the Pope's dispensing power." Three questions were accordingly framed and sent to the universities of Paris, Louvain, Alcala, Douay, Salamanca, and Valladolid, for their opinions.

The queries and answers are as follows:

THE QUERIES.

1. Has the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever, within the realm of England?

2. Can the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individuals of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense with his majesty's subjects, from their oath of allegiance upon any pretext whatsoever?

3. Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transaction, either of a public or a private nature?

THE ANSWERS.

University of Paris: After an introduction, according to the usual forms of the university, the Sacred Faculty of Divinity of Paris answer the first query by declaring:

Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any other person of the Church of Rome, hath any civil authority, civil

power, civil jurisdiction, or civil pre-eminence whatsoever, in any kingdom; and, consequently, none in the kingdom of England, by reason or virtue of any authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence, by divine institution inherent in, or granted, or by any other means belonging to the Pope, or the Church of Rome. This doctrine the Sacred Faculty of Divinity of Paris has always held, and upon every occasion maintained, and upon every occasion has rigidly proscribed the contrary doctrines from her schools.

Answer to the second query. Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of them, nor any person of the Church of Rome, can, by virtue of the keys, absolve, or release the subjects of the King of England from their oath of allegiance.

This and the first query are so intimately connected, that the answer of the first immediately and naturally applies to the second, and so forth.

Answer to the third query. There is no tenet in the Catholic Church, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or those who differ from them in matters of religion. The tenet, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics, is so repugnant to common honesty and the opinions of Catholics, that there is nothing of which those who have defended the Catholic faith against Protestants, have complained more heavily, than the malice and calumny of their adversaries in imputing this tenet to them, and so forth.

Given at Paris in the General Assembly of the Sorbonne, held on Thursday, the 11th day before the Kalends of March, 1789.

Signed in due form.

University of Douay: To the first and second queries the Sacred Faculty answers—That no power whatsoever, in civil or temporal concerns, was given by the Almighty, either to the Pope, the Cardinals, or the Church herself, and, consequently, that kings and sovereigns are not in temporal concerns, subject by the ordination of God, to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever; neither can their subjects, by any authority granted to the Pope or Church, from above, be freed from their obedience, or absolved from their oath of allegiance.

This is the doctrine which the doctors and professors of divinity hold and teach in our schools, and this all the candidates for degrees in divinity maintain in their public theses, and so forth.

To the third question the Sacred Faculty answers—That there is no principle of the Catholic faith by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, who differ from them in religious opin-

ion. On the contrary, it is the unanimous doctrine of Catholics, that the respect due to the name of God, so called witness, requires that the oath be inviolably kept, to whomsoever it is pledged, whether Catholic, Heretic, or Infidel, and so forth.

Signed and sealed in due form, at a meeting of the Faculty of Divinity of the University of Douay, January 5, 1789.

University of Louvain: The Faculty of Divinity at Louvain, having been requested to give her opinion upon the questions stated, does it with readiness—but struck with astonishment that such questions should, at the end of this eighteenth century, be proposed to any learned body, by inhabitants of a kingdom that glories in the talents and discernment of its natives. The Faculty being assembled for the above purpose, it is agreed with the unanimous assent of all voices to answer the first and second queries absolutely in the negative.

The Faculty does not think it incumbent upon her in this place to enter upon the proofs of her opinion, or to show how it is supported by passages in the Holy Scriptures, or the writing of antiquity.—That has already been done by Bossuet, De Marca, the two Barclays, Goldastus, the Pithæuses, Argentre Widrington, and his Majesty King James the First, in his dessertation against Bellarmine and Du Perron, and by many others, and so forth.

The Faculty then proceeds to declare that the sovereign power of the State is in no wise (not even indirectly as it is termed) subject to, or dependant upon any other power, though it be a spiritual power, or even though it be instituted for eternal salvation, and so forth.

That no man or any assembly of men, however eminent in dignity and power, not even the whole body of the Catholic Church, though assembled in general council, can upon any ground or pretense whatsoever, weaken the bond of union between the sovereign and people; still less can they absolve and free the subjects from their oath of allegiance.

Proceeding to the third question, the said Faculty of Divinity (in perfect wonder that such a question should be proposed to her) most positively and unequivocally answers—That there is not, and there never has been among the Catholics, or in the doctrines of the Church of Rome, any law or principle which makes it lawful for the Catholics to break their faith with heretics, or others of a different persuasion from themselves in matters or religion, either in public or private concerns.

The Faculty declares the doctrine of the Catholics to be, that the divine and natural law, which makes it a duty to keep faith and prom-

ises, is the same; and is neither shaken nor diminished, if those with whom the engagement is made, hold erroneous opinions in matters of religion, and so forth.

Signed in due form 18th of Nov., 1788.

University of Alcala: To the first question it is answered—That none of the persons mentioned in the proposed question, either individually, or collectively in council assembled, have any right in civil matters; but that all civil power, jurisdiction and pre-eminence are derived from inheritance, election, the consent of the people, and other such titles of that nature.

To the second it is answered, in like manner—That none of the persons above mentioned have a power to absolve the subjects of his Britannic Majesty from their oaths of allegiance.

To the third question it is answered—That the doctrine which would exempt Catholics from the obligation of keeping faith with heretics, or with any other persons who dissent from them in matters of religion, instead of being an article of Catholic faith, is entirely repugnant to its tenets.

Signed in usual form, March 17, 1789.

University of Salamanca: To the first question it is answered—That neither Pope nor Cardinals, nor any assembly or individual of the Catholic Church, have as such, any civil authority power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence in the kingdom of England.

To the second it is answered—That neither Pope nor Cardinals, nor any assembly or individual of the Catholic Church, can, as such, absolve the subjects of Great Britain from their oaths of allegiance, or dispense with their obligation.

To the third it is answered—That it is no article of Catholic faith, that Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or with persons, of any description, who dissent from them in matters of religion.

Signed in the usual for, March 7th, 1789.

University of Valladolid: To the first question it is answered—That neither Pope nor Cardinals, or even a general council, have any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, in the kingdom of Great Britain; or over any other kingdom or province in which they possess no temporal dominion.

To the second it is answered—That neither Pope nor Cardinals, nor even a general council, can absolve the subjects of Great Britain from their oaths of allegiance, or dispense with their obligation.

To the third it is answered—That the obligation of keeping is grounded on the law of nature, which binds all men equally, without respect to their religious opinions; and with regard to Catholics, it is still more cogent as it is confirmed by the principles of their religion.

Signed in the usual form, Feb. 17th, 1789.

With these documents before us, we must necessarily say that if Catholics are regardless of the obligation of an oath, the British Catholics and the Irish Catholics give us the most extraordinary exhibition which the world ever saw; men suffering persecution during ages, from which persecution they might be relieved merely by taking an oath, and, yet refusing to take an oath, and thus remaining under affliction, in preference to swearing against their conviction, though we are told, they believed that they may be dispensed with from the observation of the oath, by the head of their Church. Is it possible that Bishop Kemp and his associates could believe this to be the fact? If they do, what must we think of their intellect?

Two years have not yet elapsed since the practical illustration of this libel upon Catholics was made in this State of South Carolina, in presence of the honorable Judge Gaillard, whilst he presided in the court at York district. I have the fact from himself, with his leave to use it as I may think proper. A criminal whose guilt was proved, was about to be left to the jury for their verdict, when his lawyer seriously offered to prove that the principle witness was suspected of being a Catholic, and therefore incredible upon oath, and consequently that his testimony should go for nothing! Judge Gaillard, though a member of the same Church as Bishop Kemp, has liberality and good sense, and knows more of the doctrine of our Church than, I believe, does the Bishop, disposed of the objection as he ought. But what shall we think of a body of the clergy of those States who publish this libel in White's book?

I now copy the extract from White upon which I shall next proceed to comment.

"It would be much more difficult to explain upon what creditable principle of their Church the Catholic divines of those kingdoms can give their approbation to oaths tendered for the security of the Protestant establishment. The clergy of the Church of England have been involved in a general and indiscriminate charge of hypocrisy and simulation, upon religious matters. It would ill become one in my peculiar circumstances to take up the defence of that venerable body; yet I cannot dismiss this subject without solemnly attesting, that the strongest impresions which enliven and support my Christian faith, are derived from my friendly intercourse with members of that insulted clergy;

while, on the contrary, I knew but very few Spanish priests whose talents or acquirements were above contempt, who had not secretly renounced their religion. Whether something similar to the state of the Spanish clergy may not explain the support which the Catholic priesthood of these kingdoms seem to give to oaths so abhorrent from the belief of their Church, as those which must precede the admission of members of that Church into parliament; I will not undertake to say. If there be conscientious believers among them, which I will not doubt for a moment, and they are not forced into silence, as I suspect it is done in similar cases, I feel assured that they will earnestly deprecate and condemn all engagements on the part of the Roman Catholics, to support and defend the Church of England. Such an engagement implies either a renunciation of the tenet excluding Protestants from the benefits of Gospel promises, or a shocking indifference to the eternal welfare of men.

"If your leaders, whom it would be uncharitable to suspect of the latter feeling, have so far receded from the Roman creed as to allow us the common privileges of Christianity, and conscientiously swear to protect and encourage the interests of the Church of England, let them, in the name of truth, speak openly before the world, and be the first to remove that obstacle to mutual benevolence, and perfect community of political privileges—the doctrine of exclusive salvation in your Church. Cancel but that one article from your creed, and all liberal men in Europe will offer you the right hand of fellowship. Your other doctrines concern but yourselves; this endangers the peace and freedom of every man living, and that in proportion to your goodness: it makes your very benevolence a curse. Believe a man who has spent the best years of his life where Catholicism is professed without check of dissenting opinion; where it luxuriates on the soil, which fire and sword have cleared of whatever might stunt its natural and genuine growth; a growth incessantly watched over by the head of your Church, and his authorized representatives, the Inquisitors. Alas! 'I have a mother!' outweighed all other reasons for a change, in a man of genius,[15] who yet cared not to show his indifference to the religious system under which he was born. I, too, 'had a mother,' and such a mother as, did I possess the talents of your great poet, tenfold, they would have been honored in doing homage to the powers of her mind and the goodness of her heart. No woman could love her children more ardently, and none of those children was more vehemently loved than myself. But the

[15] Pope: see his letter to Atterbury on this subject.

Roman Catholic creed had poisoned in her the purest source of affection. I saw her, during a long period, unable to restrain her tears in my presence. I perceived that she shunned my conversation, especially when my university friends drew me into topics above those of domestic talk. I loved her; and this behaviour cut me to the heart. In my distress I applied to a friend to whom she used to communicate all her sorrows; and, to my utter horror, I learnt that, suspecting me of Anti-Catholic principles, my mother was distracted by the fear that she might be obliged to accuse me to the Inquisition, if I incautiously uttered some condemned proposition in her presence. To avoid the barbarous necessity of being the instrument of my ruin, she could find no other means but that of shunning my presence. Did this unfortunate mother overrate or mistake the nature of her Roman Catholic duties? By no means. The inquisition was established by the supreme authority of her Church; and, under that authority, she was enjoined to accuse any person whatever, whom she might overhear uttering heretical opinions. No exception was made in favor of fathers, children, husbands, wives: to conceal was to abet their errors, and doom two souls to eternal perdition. A sentence of excommunication, to be incurred in the fact, was annually published against all persons, who having heard a proposition directly or indirectly contrary to the Catholic faith, omitted to inform the inquisitors upon it. Could any sincere Catholic slight such a command?

"Such is the spirit of the ecclesiastical power to which you submit. The monstrous laws of which I speak, do not belong to a remote period: they existed in full force fifteen years ago: they were republished, under the authority of the Pope, at a later period. If some of your writers assume the tone of freedom which belongs to this age and country; if you profess your faith without compulsion; you may thank the Protestant laws which protect you. Is there a spot in the universe where a Roman Catholic may throw off his mental allegiance, except where Protestants have contended for that right, and sealed it with their blood? I know that your Church modifies her intolerance according to circumstances, and that she tolerates in France, after the revolution, the Hugeunots, whom she would have burnt in Spain a few years ago, and whom she would doom to some indefinite punishment, little short of the stake, at the present moment. Such conduct is unworthy of the claims which Rome contends for, and would disgrace the most obscure leader of a paltry sect. If she still claims the right of wielding 'the sword of Peter,' why does she conceal it under her mantle? If not, why does she not put an end to more than half the miseries and degradation of Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Spanish America, by at once de-

claring that men are accountable only to God for their religious belief, and that sincere and conscientious persuasion must both in this and the next world, be a valid plea for the pardon of error? Does the Church of Rome really profess this doctrine? It is then a sacred duty for her to remove at once that scandal of Christianity, that intolerance which the conduct of Popes and councils has invariably upheld. But if, as I am persuaded, Rome still thinks in conformity with her former conduct, and yet the Roman Catholics of these kingdoms dissent from her on this point, they have already begun to use the Protestant right of private judgment upon one of the articles of their faith; and I may hope that they will follow me in the examination of that alleged divine authority by which they are prevented from extending it to all."

This passage I shall consider in my next.

Yours, and so forth,

B. C.

LETTER XXIV

CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 19, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I proceed now to examine the paragraph of White's *Evidence*, which I added to my last letter.

The extract commences with a fallacious change of terms, which fallacy is continued with increased dishonesty through the entire passage; every logician knows that a change of terms is the most criminal species of bad reasoning. I need only exhibit to you the fact, and quote the expression of White.

I have in my former letters shown that the object of this man's employers was to perpetuate the exclusion of Roman Catholics from the British houses of parliament. For this purpose he writes in page 53:

"At the time when I am writing this, one branch of the legislature has declared itself favorable to what is called Catholic emancipation; and, for any thing I can conjecture, Roman Catholics may be allowed to sit in parliament before these letters appear in public. A Roman Catholic legislator of Protestant England would, indeed, feel the weight of the difficulty to which my suggested question alludes, provided his attachment to the Roman Catholic faith were sincere."

And in pages 56 and 57, he has the following passage addressed to the Catholic clergy:

"A conscientious Roman Catholic may, for the sake of public peace, and in the hope of finally serving the cause of his Church, obstensibly

give a free course to heresy. But, if it may be done without such dangers, it is his unquestionable duty to undermine a system of which the direct tendency is, in his opinion, the spiritual and final ruin of men. Is there a Catholic divine who can dispute this doctrine? Is there a learned and conscientious priest among you, who would give absolutiion to such a person as, having it in his power so to direct his votes and conduct in parliament as to diminish the influence of Protestant principles, without disturbing or alarming the country, would still heartily and steadfastly join in promoting the interests of the English Church."

The Protestant dissenter who sits in the British Parliament is not required to swear or to promise that he will "heartily and steadfastly join in promoting the interest of the English Church." The Catholic seeks admittance only upon that principle, upon which it has been conceded to the Presbyterian, to the Baptist, to the Unitarian, and to the Jew, for I believe there are members of that nation in the British Parliament, I know there were; and I know there is nothing to prevent their admission; for the oath of supremacy and the Test Act are equivalently repealed, and there is no oath now required, save that of allegiance, and of abjuration of Popery. Thus, in fact, the British House of Parliament is open to every and to any person of any religion, or of no religion, unless he be a Roman Catholic. Hence, the case is grossly misstated by White, in asserting that a Roman Catholic would, upon entering parliament, be obliged to swear that he would "heartily and steadfastly join in promoting the interests of the English Church." The Catholic only requires to have the oath and declaration against Popery consigned, together with Test Act and the oath of supremacy, to the tomb of all the Capulets.

But a difficulty arose in the minds of the English churchmen respecting Catholics, and was special in their case. They knew that all their rich benefices were but the remnants of donations given by pious Catholics during centuries to their own Catholic Church; and their terrors arose at the prospect of restitution. It was not the pang of a lacerated conscience, but the terror of an avaricious heart, which proclaimed, "Beware of those Catholics, for they will reclaim the property of their Church." Thus the whole bench of Bishops, with him of Osnaburg as their blaspheming leader, arose to vote for the eternal exclusion of the Catholic. The whole, did I write? No! The good, the just, the benevolent Bathurst of Norwich, and the fearless and upright Bishop of Rochester, would not unite with the ruthless oppressors. The Catholics assured the houses, long before, that upon this subject they need have no dread, and swore, and continue to swear, that "they will

not use any right or privilege which they now enjoy, and may become entitled to, by any act of the legislature in their favor, in order to subvert or disturb the establishment of the Church, now by law Protestant, for the purpose of substituting a Roman Catholic establishment in its stead." Thus they gave those oaths, whose value has endured so searching a test as a guarantee that this terror was without foundation. Have you, my friends, ever known the possessor of rapine disposed to believe the declarations of the injured party, that he will seek no restitution? Men generally judge of others by themselves. But this is not my object. The truth is, then, that a Roman Catholic, if admissable to parliament, would not be required to swear that he would "promote the interest of the Protestant Church;" but he would be required to swear not "to take its income away, for the purpose of giving it to the Catholic Church."

Thus the writer of the *Evidence* was guilty of misstatement, when he insinuated that a Catholic would be required to swear "that he would heartily and steadily join in promoting the interests of the English Church." In the passage before us, he commences by stating accurately the fact, in page 70, where he mentions that "the Catholic divines of those kingdoms give their approbation to oaths tendered for the security of the Protestant establishment." Security is not promotion of interest, and there is a wide difference between a Church and an establishment, as Bishop Kemp himself feelingly knows. Not only does this wide difference exist, but one still more palpable; for if by any sophistry, the two phrases could be brought to appear as equivalent to each other, still the Catholic could not be said to promote the interests of the Protestant Church by taking an oath; but that interest is promoted by the Protestant legislature, which, by requiring the oath, secures the establishment against the aggression of the Catholics; so that the requisition of this oath is perpetual evidence of the continued disposition of the Catholic not to secure the establishment by his own act. Yet this is what White calls, in page 71, "oaths abhorrent from the belief of their own Church, which must precede the admission of Catholics into parliament;" "engagements on the part of the Roman Catholics, to support and defend the Church of England." In page 72, "conscientiously swear to protect and encourage the interests of the Church of England." The whole of White's argument is, then, based upon a false assumption, viz. that Roman Catholics seek admission into parliament upon the condition that they will swear "heartily and steadily to protect and to promote the interests of the Protestant Church." Whereas, the fact is, they seek it only upon the condition of not asking to resume the property of which

they and their Church have been plundered by Henry VIII, the protectors of Edward VI, Elizabeth, the Stuarts, and the House of Hanover, under the pretext of reforming religion. And the writer of the *Evidence,* by a gradual strengthening of his impressions, and using the weaker and the stronger, as if their meaning was the same, deludes the great body of his readers who hastily glance along his pages. Was this the case with the body of the American clergy who gave the book to their flocks? Were they misled by the sophistry? Or were they ignorant of the facts? Or, knowing the delusion, did they recommend the book for the charitable purpose of creating an unfavorable impression of the claims of the persecuted Catholics of the British empire, and a dislike of the Catholics of this Union?

White next asserts, that "the clergy of the Church of England have been involved in a general and indiscriminate charge of hypocrisy and simulation upon religious matters." As he does not specify the grounds of the charge, nor the person by whom it is made, I am left solely to conjecture. I have frequently heard a conclusion drawn from premises which were never questioned; and this conclusion in some degree involved the charge. (1). It is a notorious fact, that the clergy of the Church of England subscribe, and perhaps swear, their assent and consent to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church, on several occasions of the most solemn and religious description. (2). It is a notorious fact, that a vast portion of the clergy that have thus subscribed, publicly declare that they do not believe the truth of several of those articles. (3). It is a notorious fact, that during a very long period some divines of that Church have maintained that no person can conscientiously subscribe his assent and consent to articles which he believes to be false. (4). It is a notorious fact that during an equally long period, some divines of that Church have maintained that a person may conscientiously subscribe his assent and consent to articles of religion which he believes not to be true, provided he does not intend to preach against them, or to teach a doctrine which contradicts them. (5). It is a notorious fact, that the great bulk of the clergy of the Protestant Church of England and of Ireland, avow that they subscribe upon this last principle, and that they do not believe all the doctrines contained in those articles to be true. From those facts, the inference has been frequently drawn; and I think that the writer of the *Evidence* acted very wisely in not undertaking the defence of "that venerable body."

I have already shown how very little reliance is to be placed upon White as a witness, and therefore we can easily know the value of his assertion that "the strongest impressions which enliven and support

his Christian faith are derived from his friendly intercourse with members of that insulted clergy.'' For my part I know from White's own book that he does not assent to the truth of the articles of the Church of England or he writes what he does not believe, and besides this certain knowledge, I am of the opinion that he has no Christian faith. I am at a loss to know how the English Protestant clergy are insulted by believing their own testimony of themselves, viz. that they do not as a body believe in the truth of those articles to which they have sworn or at least subscribed their assent and consent: and I must avow that it would be adding to my stock of information, if the process were explained by which a man is confirmed in Christian faith by friendly intercourse with a clergy who are not agreed as to the articles which ought to be believed as being the revelation of Christ. But surely we would be more to blame, if instead of taking the character of the Protestant clergy of England from themselves, we were to seek out some profligate, who had in his early youth undertaken the solemn obligations of the ministry with a knowledge that he had not the requisite qualifications; who spent his best years with irreligious companions in low debauch, who studied the worst works of infidels, to destroy in himself that faith which he preached to the people, upon which he lived, who closed his career of ten years' hypocrisy by vilifying his family, and who having fled from the punishment due to his multiplied crimes to a land which persecuted the professors of his ancient Church, of his father's land, earned the protection of its oppressive government by entreating it to continue its persecution; and calumniated his brethren for the purpose of palliating the criminality of that persecution. In a word, we prefer doing as we have done, to acting as Bishop Kemp and his associates have done, when they adduced the wretched White as the witness against the Catholic world. From their own mouths we take the testimony upon which we prove our charges against our opponents. We are assailed by the testimony of the profligates whom we have cast out, bolstered up by men who fill respectable offices.

Upon such testimony as this, Bishop Kemp and his associates have ventured to tell their flocks that there were ''but few Spanish priests whose talents or requirements were above contempt, who had not secretly renounced their religion.'' I say they tell this to their flocks, because they assure them that they may rely upon the statement of White who says, page 70, that he knew this to be a fact. I tell those gentlemen that such is not the fact. But if it was, see the dilemma to which they are reduced. They assert [that] the bigotry of the Spanish clergy is the proof of the bigotry of Roman Catholics; they assert that

the Spanish clergy are not Roman Catholics. Now if they are not themselves members of our Church, why impute to us their bigotry, if they are bigots? As for the miserable exception of those whose talents or acquirements were below contempt: I can assure the "venerable body" that it would be found very small indeed. "The ignorant clergy of Spain" is a fashionable phrase, but if it is a true phrase, I believe we shall find a very ignorant clergy in other parts of the world, and perhaps even the Protestant clergy of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Washington would not escape; White is himself looked upon as not an ignorant man in the English University of Oxford, and in 1817, he published at Oxford a series of lectures upon the study of religion; yet he avows in page 17, that he "was not of sufficient standing" to obtain a degree of licentiate of divinity at the Spanish University of Seville, and he avows in the note of that page, that a licentiate must undergo a severe examination before he can obtain either the rights or the honors of Doctorship. Some of the best informed theologians whom I have ever met with were educated amongst this "ignorant Spanish clergy." In their schools were formed some of the best teachers from whom I ever imbibed any knowledge; and for my own part I must avow, [that] when I hear any person speak of the gross ignorance of the Spanish Clergy, I suspect he never had an opportunity of knowing what they are, or was unable to turn that opportunity to account. I must avow my misfortune , if misfortune it is, that I have studied under no better masters than those formed altogether in the Spanish, the Portuguese, the Flemish, the French, and the Italian schools: hence I may obtain some of the commiseration of the "venerable body," in regard to my stinted opportunities: and they will perhaps still more pity the delusion which leads me to boast that I owe all my knowledge to priests, and to thank Heaven that to England I owe nothing, save the detestation of her persecution and the forgiveness of her injuries. This libellous attack of White's upon the Spanish Clergy, has in Europe called forth a triumphant refutation, and the most ample testimonies have been given to the worth, the learning and the virtue of the calumniated Spanish Clergy; no person will deny that there are criminals to be found in their body, as a criminal was to be found in the Apostolic band; but collectively taken, the Clergy are learned and virtuous. There must be exceptions, of which White himself is an unfortunate exemplification. In Ireland the venerable, learned, and virtuous Primate of Armagh, the amiable and talented Primate of Dublin, the Archbishop of Tuam, the Bishops of Ardagh and of Ossory, are, and the late Archbishop of Cashel, was, an exhibition of the Spanish School, as the Bishop of Kildare and Leigh-

lin, (Doyle,) and the Bishop of Waterford and Lismore are of the Portuguese. In the searching examinations before the committees of the British Parliament, most of those Prelates were closely and elaborately and ingeniously sifted, and won the approbation and esteem and respect of their very enemies, whilst the only Protestant Prelate whom Ireland exhibits as a theologian, Magee of Dublin, so far lost himself in the House of Lords, that not only did he sink in the estimation of the committee, but it was resolved that a portion of his testimony should be expunged, and expunged it was! The American Clergy who have drawn us into this discussion, must be very ignorant of the state of things across the Atlantic, or totally heedless of the consequence of their assaults upon us here with their imported weapons. I advise them to be quiet.

The next passage is as little founded in decency as it is fact, "that the Catholic priesthood of these kingdoms" are "in a state similar to the Spanish clergy," that this "may explain the support which they seem to give to oaths so abhorrent from the belief of their Church," viz. "those which must precede the admission of Catholics into Parliament." "If there are conscientious believers amongst the Catholic priesthood, they are either forced into silence or they deprecate those oaths."

Here are a number of distinct and calumnious falsehoods brought forward to explain a fable.

The fable is, that the Catholics previous to being admitted into Parliament engaged to swear that they will support and defend the Church of England. The calumnious falsehoods are—

1. That very few Spanish priests whose talents or acquirements were above contempt, adhered conscientiously to their religion.

2. That only the supposition of the Irish and English Catholic priesthood being in a similar state could rationally explain their conduct.

3. That the oath required of Catholics previous to their admission into Parliament, is abhorrent from the belief of their Church.

This proposition, perhaps, is not a falsehood, for it is nonsense. I do not know how an oath can feel horror, or how it can be abhorrent from belief: however, as Mr. White is a foreigner, I shall give what I suppose he meant by what he wrote, viz:

The oath is in opposition to the tenets of the Catholic Church.

4. In those cases, conscientious believers deprecate and condemn the oath and engagement.

5. But in those cases they are forced into silence.

6. Such force has been used in similar cases.

7. The engagement implies either a renunciation of the tenet ex-

cluding Protestants from the benefits of the Gospel promises or a shocking indifference to the eternal welfare of man.

The last is not so properly a false statement as a false inference, and may be dismissed by merely observing that the disjunction is not good, as several middle propositions might be found as alternatives; and next, as the engagement is only a promise not to seek for restitution of Church property, it has nothing to do either with Gospel promises or indifference to man's salvation.

An attempt is made in the following, to sustain the sixth proposition:—

I recollect something about the persecution of Mr. Gandolphy, a London priest, who was obliged to appeal to Rome against the persecution of his brethren, for exposing too freely the doctrines which might increase the difficulties of the Catholic emancipation. The Pope did not condemn him. Since I have seen the case of Mr. Gandolphy stated in an able publication Croly's *Popery and the Popish Question*. Mr. G's doctrines were highly approved at Rome.

It would have been much more to the purpose to state correctly and fully the proof than to pretend it existed. Mr. Gandolphy's case has nothing in it which can support the truth of the above proposition: as I do not wish to encumber my matter unnecessarily, I shall only say, I am ready to meet any attempt of this description when it shall be made.

It is very strange also to find that Mr. Gandolphy who wrote in London, and published his book in that city, and who appealed, as it is said, to Rome, and was, as it is said, sustained by Rome, was forced to be silent. Could the "venerable body" explain what this sort of silence means? Writing, speaking, printing, publishing, appealing, obtaining the approbation of the supreme tribunal for what was so written, said, printed and published, means, being forced into silence!! Wonderful discovery!!! White, in addition to his other good qualities, has proved himself to be the very pink of lexicographers. I must close this letter.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXV

CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 26, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I now come to the topic which has, during centuries, afforded a most prolific source of calumny, and an abundant theme of declamation to our opponents. I shall enter upon it at some length; you will therefore have need of patience, and my excuse must be found in the importance of the subject and the injustice of our assailants.

White continues in the following strain:

"If your leaders, whom it would be uncharitable to suspect of the latter feeling, have so far receded from the Roman creed as to allow us the common privileges of Christianity, and can conscientiously swear to protect and encourage the interests of the Church of England, let them, in the name of truth, speak openly before the world, and be the first to remove that obstacle to mutual benevolence, and perfect community of political privileges—the doctrine of exclusive salvation in your Church. Cancel but that one article from your creed, and all liberal men in Europe will offer you the right-hand of fellowship. Your other doctrines concern but yourselves; this endangers the peace and freedom of every man living, and that in proportion to your goodness; it makes your very benevolence a curse."

The doctrine of exclusive salvation is the vision which appals the lisping infant in the nursery, is given as the schoolboy's theme, rounds the period of joyous graduates at commencement-day, affords scope for the amplification of the spouter at the sanctified assembly of collectors of cents, rouses the ire of the raving enthusiast, fills the eye of deluded piety, and is as solemnly given by doting age as it is flippantly stated by careless infidelity to be the attribute of Popery, the characteristic of our Church, the mark of Antichrist. What in the name of wonder is the meaning of this cabalistic phrase; this so frequently repeated, and so little understood, expression? The phrase, taken in its obvious meaning, is, that salvation is to be had only in some special way, that is by that mode to the exclusion of all others. In this general principle every human being agrees, that there is some one way which man must follow to be saved. When I say every human being, I mean every one who believes in a state of salvation and in a state of damnation; even the Universalist, who says that all will ultimately be saved, is included, for he believes that there is at least a purgatory, though not a hell: and this purgatory is so far a state of damnation.

There is not a human being then who does not hold the doctrine of exclusive salvation: the difference of their belief consists only in the different extent and description of the exclusion. The Deist excludes the murderer and the robber: the Mahometan excludes the infidel: the Christian requires the belief of the doctrines of Jesus Christ and a conformity to his law on the part of all those to whom that law is promulgated; the Presbyterian, who believes in the Trinity, excludes the Socinian and the Unitarian; the Episcopalian excludes those who have not apostolical ministry, or who wilfully or carelessly follow corrupt doctrine. Thus, in a word, there is no religious division which does not exclude many persons from salvation.

If, therefore, the doctrine of exclusive salvation be "an obstacle to perfect community of political privileges," every sect which in any way acquired political privileges must suppose itself justified in not admitting others to any participation therein. Is this the political doctrine of Bishop Kemp and the "venerable body?" And yet how White and they inveigh against Spain and South America! The doctrine of exclusive salvation, then, means the belief that only some persons will be saved. Would White have us believe that all persons will be saved? Yet he would call himself a Christian, and a member of the Church of England; of that Church whose 18th article is in the following words:

"They also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved."

In 1814, White tells us, page 32, *Evidence*, that he subscribed this article: thus he subscribed the doctrine of exclusive salvation. Bishop Kemp, subscribed, this same doctrine, for he subscribed the same article.

In the *Presbyterian Confession of Faith for the Church in the United States, published in 1821*, chapter x, Of effectual calling, section iv, it is stated as follows:

"Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved: much less can men, not possessing the Christian religion, be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the law of nature, and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may, is very pernicious and to be detested."

This *Confession of Faith* is adopted by some of the venerable body which has charged the holding of the doctrine of exclusive salvation to be making our very benevolence a curse, and makes us dangerous to the peace and freedom of every man living. The same doctrine is found word for word in the corresponding chapter and section of the *Confession of Faith of the Associate and Reformed Church, following the Church of Scotland, in the United States of America, as published in* 1813. This denomination is, I believe, generally known by the appellation of "Covenanters." I add here, the questions and answers upon the subject from the larger catechism, which are in the Presbyterian and Covenanting Churches word for word the same, page 194, Presbyterian.

"Q. 59. Who are made partakers of redemption through Christ?

"A. Redemption is certainly applied, and effectually communicated, to all those for whom Christ hath purchased it; who are in time by the Holy Ghost enabled to believe in Christ: according to the Gospel.

"Q. 60. Can they who have never heard the Gospel, and so know not Jesus Christ, nor believe in him, be saved by their living according to the light of nature?

"A. They who having never heard the Gospel, know not Jesus Christ, and believe not in him, cannot be saved, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, or the laws of that religion which they profess; neither is there salvation in any other, but in Christ alone, who is the Saviour only of his body, the Church.

"Q. 61. Are all they saved who hear the Gospel, and live in the Church?

"A. All that hear the Gospel, and live in the visible Church, are not saved; but only they who are true members of the Church invisible.

"Q. 62. What is the visible Church?

"A. The visible Church is a society made up of all such as in all ages and places of the world do profess the true religion, and of their children.

"Q. 68. Are the elect only effectually called?

"A. All the elect, and they only, are effectually called; although others may be and often are outwardly called by the ministry of the word, and have some common operations of the Spirit; who, for their wilful neglect and contempt of the grace offered to them, being justly left in their unbelief, do never truly come to Jesus Christ."

Surely the gentlemen who teach this catechism will not deny that they teach a doctrine of exclusive salvation.

The Confession of Faith of the Reformed Dutch Church of the United States of America, published in New York in 1815, has the xxviii article of its doctrine in the following words:

"That every one is bound to join himself to the true Church."

"We believe, since this holy congregation is an assembly of those who are saved, and that out of it there is no salvation, that no person, of whatsoever state or condition he may be, ought to withdraw himself, to live in a separate state from it; but that all men are in duty bound to join and unite themselves with it, maintaining the unity of the Church; submitting themselves to the doctrine and discipline thereof; bowing their necks under the yoke of Jesus Christ; and as mutual members of the same body, serving to the edification of the brethren, ac-

cording to the talents God has given them. And that this may be the more effectually observed, it is the duty of all believers, according to the word of God, to separate themselves from all those who do not belong to the Church, and to join themselves to this congregation, wheresoever God hath established it, even though the magistrates and the edicts of princes were against it; yea, though they should suffer death or any other corporeal punishment. Therefore all those, who separate themselves from the same, or do not join themselves to it, act contrary to the ordinance of God."

The doctrine of exclusive salvation is not only taught by those whose Confessions and Catechisms I have here cited, but by all others, as I have before asserted, and shall hereafter more fully show, but I have here quoted only a few as samples of all.

I have now arrived at this point, that the general principle of the doctrine is not peculiar to our Church, but is common to every species of religious association: that the only difference between them consists on this head, of where the line is to be drawn within which, they who are in the way of salvation are to be found, and without which, they who are criminal and in a state of danger are left.

Before, however, I proceed to make that farther inquiry as to whether the Church to which we belong, or its opponents, act more reasonably and charitably in drawing this line, I shall make a previous inquiry, in order to rectify vague impressions, which are but too common, and whose vagueness and indistinctness make the doctrine appear what it really is not.

Suppose for instance I were to ask Bishop Kemp whether he has the power of condemning any person to hell; he would very properly and very naturally feel astonished at my gross ignorance, or unblushing effrontery, and he would in all Christian humility assure me that he had not. Let me ask the question of any one of his associates; I know, very naturally, that I shall be told in the same manner that he disclaims having any such power; that to pretend to its possession or exercise would, in him, be arrogance and blasphemy. But I tell them, that they have one and all, excluded from heaven and condemned to hell a large portion of the human race: for they have decided upon their damnation in those articles to which they have subscribed. The answer of the venerable body, will be very simple, and I believe very sufficient. It will be that in stating a plain fact, they only testify what they know, but the regulation lay not with them: they will tell me, that God, and he only, made the regulation, and that they only do as

St. Paul did when he wrote,[16] "Be not deceived, neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God:" they merely testify what God has regulated, not what they are disposed to do, or have the power of doing. They will still farther tell me that they consider it to be an evidence of kindness towards an unfortunate sinner to give him this information; that the declaration is made by the Apostle to remove a delusion; to save the sinner from destruction, not to send him to perdition. They will add that the Apostle wrote also:[17] "Without faith it is impossible to please him," (God); and that our Saviour said,[18] "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned," and therefore it is charity and kindness on their part and not any bad disposition towards the unfortunate fellow-beings whom they desire to save, [which] urges them to testify that those things are necessary to salvation. White himself, they would swear, agrees with them in stating, page 72, that approbation of error in doctrine would argue "a shocking indifference to the eternal welfare of man." Such, I am convinced, would be their answer substantially, if not in words. The conclusions which they would have us draw from it are, "That to declare plainly what we believe is required by God for salvation, is not to dictate to God upon what terms he must save man." "That our plain declaration of what we believe to be against God's law, is not on our part to doom to hell, the guilty person." "That our simple declaration of what we believe to be necessary for salvation, accompanied with an admonition to those who refuse conformity, of the danger of their destruction; is not a want of charity for them: in several instances, would be the best evidence of our affection for themselves, and of our zeal for their welfare."

I am, for own part, fully satisfied with the correctness of this reasoning: I give the full benefit of it to the venerable body, upon the condition that they do in like manner to me; and we shall then have arrived at this conclusion: The doctrine of exclusive salvation is no evidence of uncharitableness in those who hold it. It might create party spirit, but not as its necessary consequence.

Having cleared up so much of our way, I now complain of that gross and palpable injustice which makes criminal in the Catholic what is not rebuked in his opponents; which perpetually accuses us of il-

[16] I *Cor.* vi, 9.—King James's Version.
[17] *Heb.* xi, 6.
[18] *Mark* xvi, 16.

liberality for what is never charged as illiberal against our assailants: I complain that too many persons talk of uncharitable doctrines where they do not exist: and exhibit us as exclusively uncharitable in holding a tenet which is not peculiar to ourselves, but which is held in common by every religious society: because in truth all hold the doctrine of exclusive salvation, but the point of dispute is, where shall the line be drawn.

I shall state where we draw it, let others draw for themselves. The first principle of a Roman Catholic is: man is bound to believe all that God teaches, and to do all that God commands: whosoever refuses to believe what God proposes or to obey what he commands, is not in God's Church; and out of his Church there is no salvation. A question next presents itself, as to how the fact of what God teaches and commands can be ascertained by man, and upon this a Roman Catholic believes, that when God made the revelation of his truths and of his precepts, he entrusted their preservation to a society for which he established a special constitution and government; and that this society was by his ordinance to continue at all times the witness of the facts, and that this divinely commissioned witness was his Church; whether we view it in the patriarchal aggregation before the days of Moses; in the Aaronitic and Levitical body and their adherents to the coming of Christ; or in the Apostles and their successors and adherents, thence, to the end of the world. The Roman Catholic believes that the testimony of this body is the evidence of the truth of doctrine, and of precept, and of divine institution to those to whom that testimony is given; and that the unbounded mercy of God may provide extraordinary help for those who have never received this testimony or who have never clearly seen its foundation of certainty based upon the truth and power, and commission of God himself. Thus all they who profess their belief of what God has taught by the testimony of the Church are in its invisible society: but several comprised in this society will be excluded from salvation, because of their violation of the precepts; and probably several who do not now appear in that society, may by the extraordinary grace and favor of our merciful God be brought within its bosom by belief, and practice, and profession: and though this external profession should never be made, we cannot pass our judgment upon individuals of whose opportunities and dispositions God alone can judge. We therefore say that all who are separated from the Church are in error: but we cannot say that all who are now in error will be excluded from heaven: neither can we say that all who die under delusion are criminal: because there can be no criminality without either neglect of the opportunities which

existed, for the discovery of truth, or the obstinate rejection of discovered truth, or the base shame of professing what one knows to be truth: and we may charitably hope that those exceptions will cover a multitude. Thus our doctrine of exclusive salvation unites truth and charity together. [19]

I shall pursue this subject in my next.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXVI

CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 5, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—It has too long and too generally been the impression in these States, that the doctrine of exclusive salvation is peculiar to the Roman Catholic Church; you now perceive that such is not the fact; you are aware of its being the doctrine of every religious society. Having ascertained this point, I now proceed to make an historical inquiry, of great importance to the cause of Christianity, and to the vindication of our own character. The general impression is also in America, that it was our Church which, with a ruthless and tyrannical spirit, created that separation of Christians which here so lamentably exists: that it was we who banished from our society, and denounced damnation against the Protestants for their merely being obedient to the dictates of conscience;—are these facts?—Let us examine.

Of one fact there can be no doubt, viz. that in Europe at the commencement of the fifteenth century, Christians were in a religious unity; we will, if our opponents require it, admit, for argument sake, that this was a unity of error. But if this error were not calculated to destroy man's hope of salvation, there could be no excuse for departing therefrom: whoever went out could justify that procedure only upon the ground of the error into which that united body had fallen, being

[19] The vigorous Bishop here, leans towards the milder interpretation of the doctrine that "Outside the Church there is no salvation." It would make interesting reading to place in parallel lines this opinion of Bishop England and the uncompromising interpretation given the same doctrine by the no less vigorous and equally kind Bishop Hay, author of *The Sincere Christian.* Bishop England, by no means, intends to console Protestants with the thought that the sects to which they may belong are the way to salvation — Nor does he wish to convey the idea that the attainment of salvation is as easy for the Protestant as it is for the Catholic. There is absolutely no hope for the Protestant unless he be in entire "good faith" and faithfully fulfil his duties to God and man according to the knowledge which he is possessed. No man can enter heaven unless he be in sanctifying grace. Considering the proneness of human mating to mortal sin and the almost insuperable difficulty of obtaining pardon save through the medium of the Sacrament of Penance, the hope of Salvation for Protestants is reduced to the minimum.—ED.

so grievous, as that a communion therein would exclude the participator from salvation. And in fact, the persons who led off the separatists gave this as the reason for their secession; they called upon all others to follow them, as they loved their souls and desired to avoid damnation. In the words of a very uncharitable and libellous *Protestant Catechism* printed in 1824, by J. Crissy, and G. Goodman, in Philadelphia; and published by *The Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, for the advancement of Christianity in Pennsylvania*, for *The Episcopal Female Tract Society of Philadelphia*, we find what they have stated: after the assertion of several calumnies it asks,

Q. Can you name any other errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome?

A. Several others might be named; but those already mentioned are abundantly sufficient to show that the Church of Rome hath, in a great measure, changed the pure and holy religion of Christ, into a most wretched and dangerous superstition.

Q. What do you think of those who live in the communion of so corrupt a Church?

A. That they are under a most grievous bondage; and therefore I heartily pity them and pray for their conversion.

Q. What do you think of those who separate themselves from the Church of Rome? May they do it lawfully?

A. They not only may, but are indispensably bound by God's command to renounce all such idolatrous and sinful practices, and may rest assured of his favor in so doing. "Come out from among them, and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." II *Cor.* vi, 17.

As one of the objects of their pity, I feel under such obligations to the good ladies of this society in the city of Philadelphia, that if God spares my life, I shall pay them no slight or evanescent attention. Meantime I shall feel obliged to any friend who will forward to B. C. through the office of the *Miscellany*, the list of the officers and members of this society in the year 1823, and thence to the present period; and I hereby tender my thanks to the person who forwarded this pretty tract to the Bishop, from whom I have received it; I had not previously seen a copy. My statement then is, that if there be want of charity in calling persons by provoking names for holding alleged doctrinal errors; that want of charity did not originate with Roman Catholics; if there be criminality in asserting that persons cannot be saved by following their fathers in the profession which they had made of the Christian faith,

that criminality is not of Catholic origin; if separation because of doctrinal error is a curse to the world, that curse was not inflicted by Catholics. I shall proceed to show that we have been sinned against, and that the transgressors have imputed to us their own acts. I repeat my former assertion: and I shall fully prove its truth. *We did not separate from the Protestants.* Their fathers and our fathers were in the same Church, and their fathers left ours, alleging that they could not be saved if they remained in the communion from which they departed. With them originated the charge against our predecessors: let them retract the charge and renew the union: let them bring back things to that state in which they were at the time of this unforunate division: let them come in amongst us and we shall do every thing in our power to gratify, and to conciliate them: but we cannot charge our common ancestors with having destroyed the purity of Christ's religion, for we do not believe they did. How then, shall we be re-united, unless they come to us, or we follow them? We state that we have kept the doctrine unchanged—if such be the fact, and they do not object to our present doctrines, their fathers made a sad mistake, which it is the duty of our friends to correct: if our present doctrines are such as they do not object to, we ask them only to embrace those doctrines which we now hold, but if they tell us that these are damnable and idolatrous, are they not now repeating the assertion of the first separatists that there is no salvation in our Church, and that they cannot come back; that the union would destroy truth which God commanded them to preserve. Thus we only stand upon that ground of doctrine upon which their fathers and ours, have during centuries, stood together: their fathers left us and made new Churches, alleging, that they would be criminal if they did not: we perpetually invite their re-union, and they answer by telling us, that all who desire salvation ought to leave us, for that we have corrupted the purity of God's religion; we state that our consciences testify to us that we have not, and that the evidence of history proves that we have only followed the Apostles, and made no doctrinal changes; we invite them to follow what this evidence makes plain, and to be re-united. We are again told that we are superstitious and idolatrous, and that their value for the salvation of their souls prevents their uniting in our idolatry, and they have the modesty to state that we shock the pious and destroy charity by our doctrine of exclusive salvation. "Cancel but that one article from your creed, and all liberal men in Europe will offer you the right-hand of fellowship." Is not this worse than ludicrous? But the next assertion is, more absurd if possible. "Your other doctrines concern but yourselves." Why,

was it not upon the very score of those other doctrines the separation was made? is it not upon their score the separation is continued? If you, good gentlemen of the "venerable body," will unite with us in professing the other doctrines, we shall cancel this as far as it regards you. No! you cannot, you say, adopt our doctrines. Why then exhibit such an absurdity as the assertion that those doctrines concerned only ourselves? I have frequently had to wade through nonsense and self-contradiction, but never have I felt it so thick and muddy as in this book, so lauded, by so venerable a body!

This topic must not be too hastily passed over; I shall take two or three of the divisions of our opposed phalanx, and test the assertion by facts. I shall with all due deference begin with him who has been put forward as the leader in our denunciation, Bishop Kemp, and shall pay my respects to his Church.

In examining the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, I shall use only her own standard book, and the thirty-nine articles as she has curtailed them: so that, I shall not be accused of doing as they have done who published White's *Evidence.* I shall treat them with all fairness and honor.

In article xviii, as was seen in our last, she teaches that they are to be *accursed,* that presume to say that men may be saved in any law or sect, for there is only the name of Christ whereby man must be saved. I take the meaning of this to be, that all who do not hold the right and true Christian faith, are excluded from salvation.

The xxxvth article is in the following words: —

Art. XXXV. Of Homilies.

"The *Second Book of Homilies,* the several titles whereof we have joined, under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former *Book of Homilies,* which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers diligently and distinctly, that they may be understanded of the people.

Of the Names of the Homilies.

1. Of the right Use of the Church.
2. Against Peril of Idolatry.
3. Of Repairing and Keeping Clean of Churches.
4. Of good works; first of Fasting.
5. Against Gluttony and Drunkenness.
6. Against Excess of Apparel.
7. Of Prayer.

8. Of the Place and Time of Prayer.

9. That Common Prayer and Sacraments ought to be ministered in a known Tongue.

10. Of the Reverent Estimation of God's Word.

11. Of Alms-doing.

12. Of the Nativity of Christ.

13. Of the Passion of Christ.

14. Of the Resurrection of Christ.

15. Of the unworthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.

16. Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost.

17. For the Rogation-days.

18. Of the State of Matrimony.

19. Of Repentance.

20. Against Idleness.

21. Against Rebellion."

The exception taken by the American Church is in the following words:

This Article is received in this Church, so far as it declares the *Book of Homilies* to be an explication of Christian doctrine, and instructive in piety and morals. But all references to the constitution and laws of England are considered as inapplicable to the circumstances of this Church, which also suspends the order for the reading of said *Homilies* in Churches, until a revision of them may be conveniently made, for the clearing of them, as well from obsolete words and phrases, as from local references.

This exception is an adoption of the doctrine contained in the *Homilies*—whatever therefore has no local reference, or is not based upon the British constitution, or British law, in the *Homilies*, is adopted as a good explanation of the doctrine of the American Church.

Those Homilies are stated in the article to be comprised in two books; the first was set forth in the time of Edward VI, the second in the time of Elizabeth. They are both stated "to contain godly and wholesome doctrine," "and necessary for the time," viz. a time of transition from the Catholic to the Protestant doctrine.

My quotations are taken from the edition by Swords, 160 Pearl street, New York, 1815. In the third part of the *Sermon on Salvation,* page 25, is the following passage:

"For the right and true Christian faith is not only to believe holy Scripture, and all the foresaid articles of our faith, are true; but also to have a sure trust and confidence in God's promises, to be saved from

everlasting damnation by Christ: whereof doth follow a loving heart to obey his commandments."

I shall now state what I take to be the constituent parts of Protestant Episcopal Faith. (1). A belief of the doctrines contained in the Scriptures; the Nicene and Apostles' Creed are but partial specifications under this general head; I assume that the belief of the articles themselves is another specification. (2). Confidence in the promises of salvation through the merits of Christ. (3). And, as a consequence of this belief and confidence, the love of God manifested in the observance of his commandments. Thus, what they call faith comprises, our, 1, faith; 2, hope; 3, charity.

Now the want of any constituent part of faith destroys its existence; hence, erroneous belief being a want of belief of true doctrine, is destructive of faith, and consequently excludes from salvation.

I shall now advert to a very few of our doctrines, which the English Church and the American Church call erroneous, and for the holding of which, we are upon their principles excluded from salvation.

I shall not now stop to examine either of the articles x, or xi, or xii, but I shall take the xiiith. The Roman Catholic Church always held that in the Scriptures we are taught, that no work is deserving of God's kingdom, or of everlasting salvation, unless it be done by the special aid or grace of God, given for that purpose, through the merits of Jesus Christ; but she also taught, that many good, moral acts might be done by persons who had no faith, or the belief of the true doctrine, which acts, though not deserving of heaven, were yet performed in virtue of God's special aid; and so far from being sinful, were frequently rewarded by God with temporal blessings, and were also, as it were, inducements to him to bestow more ample and abundant and efficacious graces upon those persons who corresponded with his first aid. Those moral, good works were done before the performer had faith, or was justified; but they frequently made him meet for sanctifying grace, and by a sort of congruity or fitness deserved from the mercy of heaven, through the merits of the Redeemer, what could not be claimed upon the score of justice.

The Protestants, in the days of Edward VI, said that this was a blasphemous error of the Catholic Church, and stated that those works done without faith were all sins, and however good they might appear, yet they not only were not preparations for grace, but had the nature of sin. Thus, a man who erred concerning a doctrine, or who wanted full confidence in the promises of salvation through Christ, committed sin, when he relieved his sick or destitute brother from motives of mere

humanity or compassion. Yes, I repeat the statement. The Catholic said it was an act of human virtue, and done in consequence of God's aid, and was meet to receive some reward, perhaps grace, from God's mercy; but the Protestant said it was a sin, as being done without faith, and deserved therefore no reward, and that it was a blasphemy to believe as the Catholic Church did; and that whoever desired salvation should separate themselves from the superstitions and blaspheming Catholics. Let me not be condemned until my proof shall have been examined.

The thirteenth article of the Protestant Episcopal Church is—

"Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his spirit, are not pleasant to God, for as much as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the school authors say) deserve grace of congruity; yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin."

What would be said of our bigotry and infatuation were we to assert that a benevolent Unitarian, or a humane Quaker, neither of whom has Protestant faith, had no merit for relieving a sick family, but that we doubted not but this act of his had in it the nature of sin? The doctrine of our predecessors was, as ours is, that the act would be meritorious of increase of eternal life, through the merits of Christ, if done under the influence of his grace by a justified person; but, under any circumstances, when done even through mere motives of natural virtue, from pure benevolence without faith, it would not be sinful, but would be virtuous, and would have a sort of claim of congruity upon the Author of good to bestow some favor upon the benevolent performers. This, however, is one of our Papistical errors, and one of so deep a dye of criminality, as to be a cause for leaving our communion! As I believe several of my readers may yet be inclined to doubt the truth of my statement, the above article notwithstanding, I shall go more fully into the case.

In the second paragraph of the *Homily on Salvation*, page 21, after stating a variety of arguments, of the value of which I now take no notice, to support the doctrine of the article xi, that we are justified by faith only, and upon which rests chiefly the assertion in article xiii, that works done before faith have the nature of sin, the following passage is found: "This faith the Holy Scripture teacheth us; this is the strong rock and foundation of the Christian religion; this doctrine all old and ancient authors of Christ's Church do approve; this doctrine advanceth and setteth forth the true glory of Christ, and beateth down the vain

glory of man; this whoever denieth is not to be accounted for a Christian man, nor for a setter forth of Christ's glory, but for an adversary to Christ and his Gospel, and for a setter forth of man's vain glory," and so forth.

In the next page, the compiler of the homily insinuates a gross falsehood, viz. that Catholics claimed to be justified by their works, when, in fact, they assert that man is justified only by God, but they do not assert that useful works done with good natural motives were sinful, though the performer of those works were an infidel.

They always held that the works of natural virtue were not bad, though not sufficient for salvation; that he who aided by God performed such works, had by his obedience to the natural law, and his co-operation with the aid of heaven, a claim of congruity upon the further aid of a merciful God, so that by his co-operation with the first grace, or aid and preparation, or disposition, he became meet to receive from a merciful God a second grace, by means whereof God might justify him in his sight.

Now, if I can show that the Protestant Churches stated as a reason for their separation from the Roman Catholics, that our Church erred in extending the possibility of salvation to a greater number of persons, and a more diversified description of persons than Protestants did, I shall have shown that their doctrine of exclusive salvation is more illiberal than is ours.

Having taken the general view which I laid before you, we are better prepared to enter upon the examination of details. And first, we have seen that in article xviii they are called *Accursed*, who say that a man may be saved by diligently framing his life, according to the principles of the law of his sect and the light of nature, for he cannot be saved unless by the name of Christ. In article xvii, we are informed who they are that shall be saved, viz. the predestined, they who be justified freely, who are "made the sons of God by adoption," who "be made like to the image of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ," who "walk religiously in good works." In article xiii, we are told that works which spring not of faith in Jesus Christ are not good, but they have the nature of sin. In article xii, good works "do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith." In article xi, "we are justified by faith only." In the first part of the Sermon on Faith (*Homilies*, page 29), "without faith no good works can be done, which shall be acceptable and pleasant to God." In the homily, page 25, we are told that the foundation of this faith is the belief of the doctrines of Christ. "For the right and true Christian faith is not only to believe

that Holy Scripture and all the foresaid articles of our faith are true, but also to have a sure trust and confidence in God's merciful promises, to be saved from everlasting damnation by Christ, whereof doth follow a loving heart to obey his commandments." Here the Protestant Episcopal Church is, at least, equally exclusive in principle as is ours. I shall now point out an essential difference in favor of the liberality of our tenets. First, we do not exclude from the chance of salvation those persons who, not having heard of the name of Jesus Christ, are diligent to frame their lives according to that law which they have received, and to the light of nature: though we may run the risk of being denounced by Bishop Kemp as *Accursed* for our presumption; we refer him for our excuse to the second chapter of the *Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.* Secondly, we do not say that all works which do not spring from faith have the nature of sin, and thus we do not say that the acts of benevolence and sincere prayers of Unitarians or Deists are offensive to God, as everything must be which has the nature of sin. Thirdly, we do not say that God is not moved by those works, to look with kindness upon the performers, but we do say that, although these works were not the result of his sanctifying or justifying grace, they were the results of the co-operation of the free will of the performer with the sufficient grace which God had bestowed; and that this co-operation was an act of virtue which makes the agent meet to receive grace, and inclines God to bestow it: that although the agent has no claim of justice upon the author of grace, by reason of his co-operation, yet by reason thereof, and the mercy of heaven, there is a congruity of fitness for more grace. White would never have written as he did, if he were even a tolerable theologian; perhaps the tenets of their own Churches, as exhibited in their own doctrinal books, will appear strange to many of our assailants. The truth is, they generally speak and write upon subjects of which they know little, and are therefore inconsistent with themselves. I defy them now to subvert this proposition: "The doctrine of exclusive salvation, as taught by the Roman Catholic Church, is far more liberal and more charitable, than the doctrine of exclusive salvation taught by the Protestant Church of England, or by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America." Should this be questioned by any person, I shall take no notice of rhapsody or of rhetoric, but I am ready to maintain its truth by documentary evidence, and the only documents which I will use or admit, are the doctrinal decisions or formularies, and authorized interpretations of public official bodies, or officers of both Churches.

I shall now proceed to shew that one of the reasons for separating

from our Church was her alleged error upon the above and other heads of doctrine. In the second part of the *Sermon on Good Works*, (*Homilies*, page 41,) the professed object is to shew what works spring out of true faith and lead men to everlasting life, and it is answered the observance of God's commandments. The sermon then continues to shew how men left the commandments, and devising what they called good works, fell into idolatry. God sent Moses to take away their blindness; but the Jews "esteeming their own fantasies and devotions to be better than the institutions of God," invented pilgrimages and precious deckings of images, censing them," and so forth. "Priests and people were corrupted and blindly deceived with these abominations," until Josaphat, Josias, and Ezechias and others destroyed the same clearly, and brought the people from such their feigned inventions, unto the very commandments of God." When Christ came, he reproved them for substituting the traditions of men for the commandments of God. In the third part of the sermon, page 45, it is stated that the same dereliction of the commandments of God for "such works as men have studied out of their own brain," has displeased God,—after a long enumeration of the "false doctrine, superstition, idolatry, hypocrisy, and other abuses," and the usual subterfuge of conscious calumny, page 46, "which superstition, although (thanks to God) it had been little used in this realm, yet in divers other realms, it had been and yet is used among many, both learned and unlearned," the following expressions are found,—"Honor be to God, who did put light in the heart of his faithful and true minister of most famous memory, King Henry VIII, and gave him the knowledge of his word, and an earnest affection to seek his glory, and to put away all such superstitious and pharisaical sects, by Anti-christ invented and set up against the word, of God, and glory of his most blessed name, as he gave a like spirit unto the most noble and famous princes, Josaphat, Josias, and Ezechias. God grant all us the King's Highness' faithful and true subjects, to feed of the sweet and savoury bread of God's own word and (as Christ commanded) to eschew all our Pharisaical and Papistical leaven of men's feigned religion: which although it were before God most abominable, and contrary to God's commandments and Christ's pure religion, yet it was praised to be a most godly life, and brightest state of perfection," and so forth. After an enumeration of several "other kinds of Papistical superstitions and abuses," the Homily towards its conclusion, page 49, exhorts to "Flee all idolatory, witchcraft," and so forth.

For the present, I believe that I have proved our doctrine of exclusive salvation to be more liberal than that of Bishop Kemp, and

next, that it was "that true and faithful minister of God, King Henry VIII, who put away the superstitious, idolatrous, and Pharisaical adherents of Antichrist" the Papists. Thus we did not turn out our Protestant brethren to be damned, but they left us, lest they should be lost by remaining in our communion. Is it then not ridiculous in Blanco White and his American sponsors of the Protestant Episcopal Church to upbraid us with our doctrine of exclusive salvation? Do they expect that we shall make ours as illiberal as is theirs? God forbid, that we should exclude from every hope of salvation the poor Indian who dies knowing nothing of Christ, or the Protestant Episcopalian who is perhaps kept from our communion only by the gross misrepresentations of those who ought to know better. God forbid that although we deplore their want of faith, we should say that their works of benevolence, and their sincere prayers have the nature of sin! If they have for us the charity which we have for them, they will not bear false witness against us. I shall continue this subject.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXVII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Mar. 12, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—It is well to keep our eye closely fixed upon the subject of our examination. I am not at present inquiring as to the correctness or the incorrectness of the doctrines of our opponents: but I am ascertaining their several doctrines upon the subject of exclusive salvation, in order to show that our tenets on this head are more liberal than theirs; and therefore that the charge of illiberality upon this score came with a very bad grace from them: next, I desire to show that it was not we who left their communion, alleging that we could not be saved if we remained therein, but that it was the assertion of their predecessors, that they could not with safe consciences remain in the Church, which was common to them and to our fathers; and therefore they went out from us. Thus the charge of holding corrupt and damnable doctrines was made upon us, not by us. If it be illiberal and uncharitable for any division of Christians to make such charges against their brethren, let the imputation of want of liberality and charity be cast upon those who deserve it: for our parts, nothing will gratify us so much as to receive our brethren back to our communion. Let them only destroy those documents which charge us with having corrupted the doctrine of Christ: let them only admit that we have not erred from

the truth of the Gospel, and there shall be peace, harmony and communion between them and us again.

In my last, I have shown that the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, are more confined in their doctrine of exclusive salvation than is the Roman Catholic Church. I have also shown how they praise God for having raised up that "faithful and true minister of most famous memory, King Henry VIII," to put away our doctrine, "to eschew all our Pharisaical and Papistical leaven of man's feigned religion." I now proceed to the exhibition of the tenets of the Presbyterian Church of the United States: in doing which I use their *Confession of Faith* and *Constitution* of their Church, as printed in Philadelphia, and published by Anthony Finley, corner of Chestnut and Fourth streets, 1821, copy-right secured by the Reverend Ezra Stiles Ely, D. D., by order of the General Assembly, on behalf of the Trustees of the General Assembly of the said Church.

The chapter iii of the *Confession of Faith* is "Of God's Eternal Decree." I select a few of the sections of this chapter.

"III. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others fore-ordained to everlasting death.

"IV. These angels and men, thus predestinated and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

"V. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace.

"VI. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, fore-ordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved; but the elect only.

"VII. The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth

mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice."

From these sections I gather the doctrine of that Church to be, (1) That God has predestined some men to salvation; (2) That he has predestined the rest of mankind to damnation; (3) That those who are predestined to salvation, and who are called the elect, are so chosen, not by reason of any good which they do, but merely because God so wills; (4) That they who are predestined to damnation are so doomed, not by reason of any prevision of their misconduct, for his decree by which they are so predestined was not made because he foresaw that misconduct as future; for

"II. Although God knows whatever may or can come to pass upon all supposed conditions; yet hath he not decreed any thing because he foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass, upon such conditions;"

but for the manifestation of his glory, as is stated in section iii; (5) That as they who are elected are effectually called to faith in Christ, and kept through faith unto salvation; no person will be saved without faith.

The seventh chapter of the *Confession of Faith* is, "Of God's Covenant with Man."

"III. Man, by his fall, having made himself incapable of life by that covenant, the Lord was pleased to make a second, commonly called the Covenant of Grace: wherein he freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him, that they may be saved, and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto life his Holy Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe."

This still farther evinces the position which I have taken; as does chapter viii, "Of Christ the Mediator."

"VIII. To all those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption, he doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate to the same; making intercession for them; and revealing unto them, in and by the word, the mysteries of salvation; effectually persuading them by his Spirit to believe and obey; and governing their hearts by his word and Spirit; overcoming all their enemies by his almighty power and wisdom, in such manner and ways as are most consonant to his wonderful and unsearchable dispensation."

To these I may add, chapter x, "On Effectual Calling."

"III. Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he

pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons, who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word.

"IV. Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved: much less can men, not possessing the Christian religion, be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may, is very pernicious, and to be detested."

I might here add several other passages, but enough has been given to shew that the Presbyterian Church teaches a doctrine of exclusive salvation, because to attain salvation, faith is necessary. It is now time to see what that faith is. Chapter xiv is "Of Saving Faith."

"I. The Grace of Faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the spirit of Christ in their hearts; and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word: by which also, and by the administration of the sacraments, and prayer, it is increased and strengthened.

"II. By this faith, a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the word, for the authority of God himself speaking therein; and acteth differently, upon that which each particular passage thereof containeth; yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatenings, and embracing the promises of God for this life, and that which is to come. But the principal acts of saving faith are, accepting, receiving and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace."

"III. This faith is different in degrees, weak or strong, may be often and many ways assailed and weakened, but gets the victory; growing up in many to the attainment of a full assurance through Christ, who is both the author and finisher of faith."

What we call faith, or the belief of whatsoever has been revealed by God, being an integral portion of what is here described as faith; of course the Presbyterian Church holds fully as exclusive a principle as we do when we profess that without this true Catholic faith, no one can be saved: and as her faith, which is necessary for salvation, contains or comprehends more than does ours, so the number of individuals within the extent thereof must be fewer, and consequently her principle of exclusive salvation is less liberal than ours.

Having thus, upon the general view, established my position, I shall confirm it by enumerating some particulars. In my last, I, at

some length, and I fear very tediously, but I trust clearly, showed how far more liberal the doctrine of our Church is, than that of the Protestant Episcopalian Church, regarding the works of such as are not justified, or have not faith. The same observations apply here with equal force at least. Chapter xvi, "Of Good Works."

"VII. Works done by unregenerate men, although, for the matter of them, they may be things which God commands, and of good use both to themselves and others; yet, because they proceed not from an heart purified by faith, nor are done in a right manner, according to the word, nor to a right end, the glory of God; they are therefor sinful and cannot please God, or make a man meet to receive grace from God. And yet their neglect of them is more sinful and displeasing unto God."

I shall only remark here that if we were to teach that a benevolent Presbyterian did a sinful act in relieving a sick brother; and that an Episcopalian who neglected to do so committed a greater sin, we should expect to be assailed for our illiberality by every human being. Our Church teaches us that the Presbyterian would have done a good moral work, and that the Episcopalian would do well to join him in its performance: we know hundreds of our separated brethren of both those Churches who do those good acts; we respect and applaud them for their good moral conduct; we acknowledge that in the performance of those meritorious works they frequently give good example to our brethren in the faith, and we know that God will give them a reward; we trust they may be rendered meet for the grace of true faith. How gladly would we hail their return to that ancient Church which first gave the Gospel to their fathers!

In the above extracts it will be seen that the doctrine of exclusive salvation taught in the *Presbyterian Confession of Faith*, is not more liberal than that taught in the Protestant Episcopal Church, which I have before shown to be more illiberal than that taught by our Church. I shall now proceed to examine more minutely other portions of the *Presbyterian Confession of Faith.*

The Roman Catholic Church teaches us, whether correctly or not is not now to the purpose, that we may pray for all persons; for heretics, schismatics, infidels, excommunicated persons, and notorious criminals: some of her public prayers are specially framed to beseech God to bestow his grace upon those persons to convert them, to bless them, and so forth. She teaches her children that it is an act of charity to pray frequently for them. The Church also with confidence in the mercies of the Saviour tells us that it is a holy and a wholesome thought to pray for

the dead. The *Presbyterian Confession of Faith* tells us, chapter xxi, "Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath day," page 107:

"IV. Prayer is to be made for things lawful, and for all sorts of men living, or that shall live hereafter; but not for the dead, nor for those of whom it may be known that they have sinned the sin unto death."

Here, we are not only prohibited from praying for the dead, but also for some living description of sinners; so that upon this score we ought not to be taxed for illiberal tenets of exclusive salvation by the gentlemen who adhere to this confession of faith.

I have shown that the predecessors of the Episcopalians, and ours, were in one Church which they left, and upon the plea that they could not be saved if they remained therein; and I concluded that we were not then the persons who denounced damnation against those who went out, for having gone, but they denounced it against us for not going. I shall show you that we are denounced in the same way by the confessions of other Churches. Still continuing to look at the *Presbyterian Confession*, chapter xxv, "Of the Church," page 125:

"II. The visible Church, which is also Catholic or universal under the gospel, (not confined to one nation as before under the law) consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."

In this it is plainly taught that there is no salvation to be had, ordinarily, out of the visible Church. In page 127, we are taught:

"V. The purest Churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated, as to become no Churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan. Nevertheless, there shall be always a Church on earth, to worship God according to his will."

The next article, page 128, sets very quietly at rest all question as to what was meant by a Church which had so degenerated as to become a synagogue of Satan.

"VI. There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that anarchist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself, in the Church, against Christ, and all that is called God."

There can be little doubt, then, of their having gone out from us upon the allegation of our being joined to Antichrist, and being children of perdition: even at this day, in those States, we are frequently complimented with the appellation, in papers which are called religious,

and by writers who are said to be considered gentlemen, and who have some pretensions to scholarship. I do not notice that vehement brawlings of unlettered fanatics, nor the yelling denunciations of infuriated rhapsodists; of this each returning Sunday brings sufficient for itself. I allude to the deliberately written, and the deliberately selected vituperation of the Pope and Papists which forms a large portion of the contents of our religious publications.

The confession counts as one of our errors, a distinction which we draw between lesser offenees of God which we call venial, and greater offences which we call mortal. We teach that God will not condemn to everlasting torments in hell, those persons who die guilty of only venial sin; we say they will endure only a temporary punishment proportioned to their offences, after which endurance they will be admitted into heaven: and that only they who die guilty of mortal or grievous sins will be condemned to hell for eternity. *The Confession*, chapter xv, page 76, says:

"IV. As there is no sin so small but it deserves damnation; so there is no sin so great that it can bring damnation upon those who truly repent."

Yet we are taxed with the illiberality and cruelty of our doctrine, by the adherents of the confession!!! In chapter xxx, "Of Church censures," page 145:

"Church censures are necessary for the reclaiming and gaining of offending brethren; for deterring of others from like offences; for purging out of that leaven which might infect the whole lump; for vindicating the honor of Christ and the holy profession of the Gospel; and for preventing the wrath of God, which might justly fall upon the Church, if they should suffer his covenant, and the seals thereof, to be profaned by notorious and obstinate offenders."

This power is that of which they complain as most tyrannical usurpation of divine prerogative, in our Church, and yet they use it themselves and thus exclude from that visible Church, and from the ordinary means of salvation, notorious and obstinate offenders. We have seen before that in giving instructions to their flocks whom not to marry, we were specially noticed: "therefore such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with Infidels, Papists, or other Idolators:" nor "with such as are notoriously wicked in their life, or maintain damnable heresies." All this advice might be very good, but it really was very curious and amusing to find that portion of the venerable body which subscribed this *Confession of Faith* with sober and grave countenances telling the Roman Catholics to "remove that obstacle to

mutual benevolence, and perfect community of political privileges, the doctrine of exclusive salvation, from their Church." Perhaps this might explain, why to this day the Roman Catholics are left without that community of political privileges, I would call them rights, in North Carolina and New Jersey. I am really tired of this disgusting topic, although I have not produced half of my testimony; I shall however take a respite for to-day and conclude by asserting what I think I have proved, viz. that our doctrine of exclusive salvation is not as extensively illiberal as that of either the Episcopalian or the Presbyterian; that we did not turn them out from our body, but they left us, alleging that with safety to their souls, they could not stay in our communion; and that besides having left us to damnation for our corruption of God's pure religion, they put us into very bad company and called us very unbecoming names; and then modestly tell the world that our doctrine of exclusive salvation is really too shocking. I must test the claims of our other opponents.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXVIII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Mar. 19, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I have exhibited to you the grounds of my assertion that the doctrine of exclusive salvation as taught in the Roman Catholic Church, is not as excluding as that taught in the Protestant Episcopalian and Presbyterian Churches. The next portion of those gentlemen who appeared to be shocked at the illiberality of our tenets, which I shall consider, is that of the Congregational Church. Their doctrine in the *Confession of Faith*, published by W. W. Woodward, No. 52, South Second, corner of Chestnut street, Philadelphia, 1813, which is the *Westminster Confession*, is in all the articles and sections quoted in my last letter, word for word, the same as that of the Presbyterian Church, saving only one word, which I look upon to have been an error of the printer, in the Presbyterian copy, which in section iv, chapter x, has "not psossesing the Christian religion," where this of the Congregationalist Churches has "not professing the Christian religion." Therefore, the observations made upon the one apply with equal force to the other.

The *Confession* was "agreed upon as a part of the covenanted uniformity in religion betwixt the Churches of Christ in the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland," "by an assembly of Divines at Westminster with the assistance of commissioners from the Church of

Scotland." The assembly was opened by the authority of Parliament on the first of July, 1643, and the *Confession* was received by the assembly at Edinburgh on the 27th of August, 1647, and was ratified and approved of by the Scotch Parliament on the 7th of February, 1649.

But previously to this, the Church of Scotland had made its *National Covenant* or the *Confession of Faith*, which may be found in page 393, of the book published by Woodward. I have before adverted to this document which was first subscribed in 1580, and ratified by the general assembly on several occasions—and by the Scotch Parliament on the 11th of June, 1640, on which occasion also it was enacted with civil pains against recusants. Let us see what is its doctrine of exclusive salvation. The subscribers "protest, believe with their hearts, confess with their mouths, subscribe with their hands, and constantly affirm before God and the whole world, that *this only* is the true Christian faith and religion pleasing to God, and *bringing salvation to man*," "defended," page 394, "as God's eternal truth, and *only* ground of salvation," they "abhor and detest all contrary religion and doctrine; but chiefly all kinds of *Papistry* in general and particular heads." If you look to my Letter twenty, you will find the special heads enumerated, which occupy more than a page of the book. In page 398, they declare all who gainsay the doctrine of the confession of their faith or refuse their ministration of the sacraments, "to be no members of the true kirk within this realm and true religion presently professed, so long as they keep themselves so divided from the society of Christ's body," also, "that there is no other face of kirk nor other face of religion, than was presently at that time, by the favor of God, established within this realm," which therefore is "ever styled God's true religion, Christ's true religion, the true and Christian religion, and a perfect religion." All within this realm are bound "to recant all doctrines and errors repugnant to any of the said articles." "Papists" are "adversaries of the true religion." In page 402, they swear by the *great name of the Lord our God*, to "resist all these contrary errors and corruptions" "all the days of our life," the errors and corruptions were "novations and evils" amongst the Protestants, which they "are obliged to detest and abhor them amongst other particular heads of Papistry abjured therein."

In "the solemn league and covenant for the reformation of religion and other purposes, agreed upon by commissioners from the Parliament, and the assembly of Divines of Scotland and the like commissioners on the part of England, in 1643: in the preamble it is stated, page 411, to be caused by the necessity of opposing the practices, and so forth, "of the enemies of *God*, against the true religion," and so forth. The

second article, page 412, binds them to "endeavor the extirpation of *Popery*, Prelacy, superstition, *heresy*, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever else shall be found contrary to sound doctrine, and the power of godliness, lest they partake of other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues," and so forth. In the concluding paragraph, page 414, they pray God to bless them for the "encouragement to other Christian Churches groaning under or in danger of the yoke of *Antichristian* tyranny, to join in the same," and so forth.

In the *Directory* for public worship agreed upon by the assembly of Divines at Westminster, under the head "Of Public Prayer before the Sermon," the minister is directed amongst other things to call upon the Lord to this effect, page 442:

"To pray for the propagation of the gospel and kingdom of Christ to all nations; for the conversion of the Jews, the fulness of the Gentiles, the fall of Antichrist, and the hastening of the second coming of our Lord; for the deliverance of the distressed churches abroad from the tyranny of the antichristian faction, and from the cruel oppressions and blasphemies of the Turk; for the blessing of God upon all the reformed churches, especially upon the churches and kingdoms of Scotland, England and Ireland, now more strictly and religiously united in the solemn national league and covenant; and for our plantations in the remote parts of the world: more particularly for that church and kingdom whereof we are members, that therein God would establish peace and truth, the purity of all his ordinances, and the power of godliness; prevent and remove heresy, schism, profaneness, superstition, security and unfruitfulness under the means of grace; heal all our rents and divisions, and preserve us from breach of our Solemn Covenant."

Under the head "Of Preaching the Word," page 446, the minister is directed how to act in confuting false doctrines.

Under the head "Of Prayer after Sermon," page 448, the minister is directed to give thanks for the admirable goodness of God in freeing the land from Antichristian darkness and tyranny, and so forth.

Under the head "Concerning Visitation of the Sick," the minister is directed, page 460, to convince the sick person "to apprehend the justice and wrath of God, before whom none can stand but he that lost in himself, layeth hold upon Christ by faith."

In the directions for family worship, the fifth direction, page 473 is the following:

"V. Let no idler who hath no particular calling, or vagrant person under a pretence of a calling, be suffered to perform worship in families, to or for the same; seeing persons tainted with errors or aiming at

division, may be ready (after that manner) to creep into houses, and lead captive silly and unstable souls."

In the *Form of Church Government*, Rule 3, for examination of a candidate for Ordination, page 503, inquiry is to be made "of his knowledge of the grounds of religion and of his ability to defend the orthodox doctrine contained in them, against all unsound and erroneous opinions."

In the clause, six, "The Directory for the Ordination of Ministers," it is directed that the candidate shall be asked in the face of the congregation, after the sermon, by the minister who hath preached, amongst other things "concerning his faith in Christ Jesus, and his persuasion of the truth of the reformed religion, according to the scripture," "his zeal and faithfulness in maintaining the truth of the gospel, and the *unity* of the church, against error and schism."

From these the conclusions are obviously, 1. That the true Christian faith only will bring man to salvation; and hence the orthodox ministers are to strive against and confute heresies, errors in faith, and all unsound doctrines. 2. That Roman Catholics who are the adherents to the Pope, who is called Antichrist, chapter xxv, article vi, page 136, are declared to be enemies of God and of the true religion; they are divided from Christ's body, they are no members of the true kirk; their errors and corruptions of papistry, are to be detested and abhorred. Yet the reverend gentlemen who have subscribed and adopted this collection of doctrinal documents as their standard of belief, have the modesty to tell us through White, that our doctrine of exclusive salvation, is an obstacle to mutual benevolence, and perfect community of political privileges!!!

Before I proceed farther in the examination of the claims to consistency of those who, holding a more liberal doctrine than ours, charged us with being intolerant and uncharitable, let us take a momentary glance at their opinions of each other; after which a curious question would be, how such discordant parties could give the public so curious an exhibition.

In the "solemn acknowledgement of public sins, and breaches of the covenant," and so forth, made by order of the commission of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, passed at Edinburgh, October 6th, 1648, the first solemn promise which they make is the following, page 426:

"1. Because religion is of all things the most excellent and precious, the advancing and promoting the power thereof against all ungodliness and profanity, the securing and preserving the purity thereof

against all error, heresy and schism, and namely Independency, Anabaptism, Antinomianism, Arminianism, and Socinianism, Familism, Libertinism, Scepticism, and Erastianism, and the carrying on the work of uniformity, shall be studied and endeavored by us before all worldly interests, whether concerning the king, ourselves, or any other whatsomever."

It is a little curious to find several of those whose errors, heresies, and schisms are here said to be against the purity of religion, uniting with those who made the promise to God against them, or the successors of those sponsors, against us as their common object of assault. But how fares Bishop Kemp and his "*Apostolic Church*" in this point of view? We shall here give a passage from the preface to the *Directory*, page 435:

"Howbeit, long and sad experience has made it manifest, that the liturgy used in the Church of England (notwithstanding all the pains and religious intentions of the compilers of it) hath proved an offence, not only to many of the godly at home, but also to the reformed Churches abroad. For, not to speak of urging the reading of all the prayers, which very greatly increased the burden of it, the many unprofitable and burdensome ceremonies contained in it have occasioned much mischief, as well by disquieting the consciences of many godly ministers and people, who could not yield unto them, as by depriving them of the ordinances of God, which they might not enjoy without conforming or subscribing to those ceremonies. Sundry good Christians have been, by means thereof, kept from the Lord's table; and divers able and faithful ministers debarred from the exercise of their ministry (to the endangering of many thousand souls, in a time of such scarcity of faithful pastors), and spoiled of their livelihood, to the undoing of them and their families. Prelates and their faction have labored to raise the estimation of it to such an height as if there were no other worship, or way of worship of God amongst us, but only the service-book; to the great hindrance of the preaching of the word, and (in some places especially of late) to the justling of it out as unnecessary, or, at best, as far inferior to the reading of common prayer, which was made no better than *an idol*, by many ignorant and superstitious people, who, pleasing themselves in their presence at that service, and their lip-labor in bearing their part in it, have thereby hardened themselves in their ignorance and carelessness of saving knowledge and true piety.

"In the meantime, Papists boasted that the book was a compliance with them in a great part of their service; and so were not a little confirmed in their superstition and idolatry, expecting rather our return to

them than endeavoring the reformation of themselves; in which expectation they were of late very much encouraged, while, upon the pretended warrantableness of imposing of the former ceremonies, new ones were daily intruded upon the Church.

"Add hereunto (which was not foreseen, but since hath come to pass), that the liturgy hath been a great means, as on the one hand, to make and increase an idle and unedifying ministry, which contended itself with set forms made to their hands by others, without putting forth themselves to exercise the gift of prayer with which our Lord Jesus Christ pleaseth to furnish all his servants, whom he calls to that office; so, on the other side, it hath been (and ever would be, if continued) a matter of endless strife and contention in the Church, and a snare both to many godly and faithful ministers, who have been persecuted and silenced upon that occasion, and to others of hopeful parts, many of which have been, and more still would be, diverted from all thoughts of the ministry to other studies; especially in these latter times, wherein God vouchsafeth to his people more and better means for the discovery of error and superstition, and for attaining of knowledge in the mysteries of godliness, and gifts in preaching and prayer."

Suppose I were to leave that Church which they have so thoughtlessly assailed, could the venerable body give me an unanimous vote as to which of themselves I should join to be more secure of my salvation?

The article xxxvi of Bishop Kemp's Church is "Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers."

"The *Book of Consecration of Bishops and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, as set forth by the General Convention of this Church, in 1792,* doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering; neither hath it any thing that, of itself, is superstitious and ungodly; and, therefore, whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to said form, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered."

The preface to the book thus approved of, and declared to be free from superstition is the following:

"It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, were

approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority. And, therefore, to the intent that these orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this Church, no man shall be accounted, or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had episcopal consecration or ordination."

Thus the Protestant Episcopal Church rejects as invalid, Presbyterian ordination, and declares as sound doctrine, that her own form is not superstitious. The *Directory*, page 493, under the head "Of Classical Assemblies," denies that it is evident to all men reading the Scriptures, that there were those three orders in the Church, and undertakes to show, [that] "the Scripture doth hold out a presbytery in a Church."

The *Directory* denies the necessity or propriety of Episcopal consecration or ordination, but declares it to belong to the preaching ministers or presbyters, as under the head touching the doctrine of ordination, page 499, paragraph 4—"Every minister of the word, is to be ordained by imposition of hands, and prayer, with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong." And in page 501, under the head concerning the doctrinal part of the ordination of ministers, column 4, it is repeated, and in column 10, we read: "Preaching presbyters orderly associated, either in cities or neighboring villages are those to whom the imposition of hands doth appertain, for those congregations within their bounds respectively."

The general assembly of the kirk of Scotland, in its act approving the propositions concerning kirk government and ordination of ministers, passed at Edinburgh, on the 10th of February, 1645, gave as one of the reasons of its assent: "and considering, that as in former times there did, so hereafter, there may arise, through the nearness of contagion, manifold mischiefs to this kirk from a corrupt form of government in the kirk of England." A very slight reference to the passages before quoted concerning the Prelatical faction and the superstitious ceremonies of the common prayer, and service book, will show what was thought of the Episcopal ordination service.

I would then merely remark that we have those persons who joined in the cry against us, here arrayed against each other, each proclaiming the doctrine of exclusive salvation, each claiming to have the truth on his side, and the error on the side of his opponent, one denying the validity of the ordination of the other, and the person thus unchurched, proclaiming that he who condemns him is corrupt, and superstitious. Yet it is by a group of gentlemen of this description we are assailed for

holding a much milder doctrine of exclusive salvation than either of themselves.

It has been always the cry of our brethren of the Protestant Churches, that we held such intolerant and uncharitable doctrines as made us unfit for society: they must have been very thoughtless when they made the charge, because they not only denounced us, but denounced each other. Until the period of their separation from us, and from each other, there was unity and peace; they made the separation upon the ground of our being in a state of damnable idolatry and error, yet, they soon began to charge each other in like manner: unity was lost, peace was banished, charity was seldom found, discord and dissension have unfortunately characterized the separation. This fact is admitted, and is deplored in the *Book of Homilies* even in the days of Edward VI, in the first part of the *Sermon against Contention and Brawling*, page 112:

"St. Paul could not abide to hear among the Corinthians these words of discord or dissension, 'I hold of Paul, I of Cephas, and I of Apollos:' what would he then say if he heard these words of contention, which be now almost in every man's mouth? He is a Pharisee, he is a Gospeller, he is of the new sort, he is of the old faith, he is a new-broached brother, he is a good Catholic father, he is a Papist, he is an heretic. O how the Church is divided! O how the cities be cut and mangled! O how the coat of Christ, that was without seam, is all rent and torn! O body mystical of Christ, where is that holy and happy unity, out of the which whosoever is, he is not in Christ? If one member be pulled from another, where is the body? If the body be drawn from the head, where is the life of the body? We cannot be joined to Christ our Head, except we be glued with concord and charity one to another. For he that is not of this unity is not of the Church of Christ, which is a congregation or unity together, and not a division. St. Paul saith, 'That as long as emulation or envying, contention, and factions or sects be among us, we be carnal, and walk according to the fleshly man.' And St. James saith, 'If ye have bitter emulation or envying, and contention in your hearts, glory not of it: for where contention is, there is unsteadfastness and all evil deeds.' And why do we not hear St. Paul, which prayeth us, whereas he might command us, saying, 'I beseech you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you will speak all one thing, and that there be no dissension among you; but that you will be one whole body, of one mind, and of one opinion in the truth.' If his desire be reasonable and honest, why do we not grant it? If his request be for our profit, why do we refuse it? And if we list not to hear his petition

of prayer, yet let us hear his exhortation, where he saith, 'I exhort you, that you walk as it becometh the vocation in which you be called, with all submission and meekness, with lenity and softness of mind, bearing with one another in charity, studying to keep the unity of the Spirit by the bond of peace: for there is but one body, one Spirit, one faith, one baptism.' There is, saith he, but one body, of the which he can be no lively member, that is at variance with the other members. There is one Spirit, which joineth and knitteth all things in one. And how can this one Spirit reign in us, when we among ourselves be divided? There is but one faith; and how can we then say, he is of the old faith; and he is of the new faith? There is but one baptism; and then shall not all they which be baptized be one? Contention causeth division, wherefore it ought not to be among Christians, whom one faith and baptism joined in an unity. But if we contemn St. Paul's request and exhortation, yet at the least let us regard his earnest entreating, in the which he doth very earnestly charge us, and (as I may so speak) conjure us in this form and manner, "If there be any consolation in Christ, if there be any comfort of love, if you have any fellowship of the Spirit, if you have any bowels of pity and compassion, fulfil my joy, being all alike affected, having one charity, being of one mind, one opinion, that nothing be done by contention, or vain-glory. Who is he, that hath any bowels of pity that will not be moved with these words so pithy? Whose heart is so stoney, that the sword of these words, which be more sharp than any two-edged sword, may not cut and break asunder? Wherefore, let us endeavor ourselves to fulfil St. Paul's joy here in this place, which shall be at length to our great joy in another place. Let us so read the Scripture, that by reading thereof we may be made the better livers, rather than the more contentious disputers. If any thing be necessary to be taught, reasoned, or disputed, let us do it with all meekness, softness and lenity. If any thing shall chance to be spoken uncomely, let one bear another's frailty. He that is faulty, let him rather amend, than defend that which he hath spoken amiss, lest he fall by contention from a foolish error into an obstinate heresy."

How have the separations and heresies multiplied since then? the Episcopalian and the Presbyterian, and the several sorts of Independents, all find some heresy in each other: do they not all then teach the necessity of unity, and the necessity of belonging to the true Church, and of holding the true doctrine? And does not each of them assert that his is that Church and that doctrine? And what more does the Catholic? Why then impute to us as a crime, what in themselves is considered a religious duty? We believe that no man will be saved who

does not exert himself and use every opportunity which God affords him, to learn what God has taught that he may believe it; to learn what God commands, that he may fulfil it; we believe that Christ gave to the Apostles those doctrines and those precepts to be by them transmitted to the latest generations through their successors in the ministry; that all were to hold together in unity, receiving and preserving this testimony. Our succession is acknowledged, we say the truth has been preserved together with that succession: they have charged our body with having substituted damnable error for pure truth, and formed new societies: each society claims exclusively to be that which holds God's truth. I shall examine a few more of them.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXIX

CHARLESTON, S. C., Mar. 26, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I stated at the outset that I would enter at some length upon the topic of exclusive salvation. I shall in this letter continue the investigation. Allow me to remind you of the object I seek to attain. I desire not to set you above your Protestant competitors, to make you look down upon them as bigoted, illiberal, or ill-disposed; I desire not to make wider those breaches between the Christian denominations which are already too many and too large; I desire not to hurt the feelings of our fellow-citizens, who may not be pleased at reading the exhibition of their own tenets, as given in their own books; I desire not to create, to excite, or to continue unpleasant altercations. My object is two-fold: first to shew the incorrectness of White's statement "that the doctrine of exclusive salvation in our Church was the obstacle to mutual benevolence and perfect community of political privileges, and that if we cast it away, all liberal men would give us the right hand of fellowship;" and next to teach a little moderation to those persons who so unsparingly abuse us for what they call a blemish, which is found in every one of themselves. My object is to endeavor to repress the unmeasured contumely of ourselves and of our religion by persons who do not know their own. And if I can effect this, I shall have done more to establish charity, harmony and good will between Catholics and Protestants, than has been done for some time. I do avow that I am most anxious to attain this object; but I know that it is not to be attained without convincing persons, who have been too long permitted to indulge the notion that they were our superiors in liberality and charity, that

they have been under an egregious mistake. My task is very difficult, and probably I shall not succeed; but if I fail I shall have at least the consolation of knowing that I have marked out the path and been the pioneer to some more fortunate follower.

I now proceed to examine the doctrine of the Baptist Church upon exclusive salvation; I shall quote from the second Charleston edition, printed by J. Hoff, No. 117 Broad street, for the Charleston Baptist Association, of *A Confession of Faith, put forth by the elders and brethren of many congregations of Christians (baptized upon profession of their faith) in London and the country, adopted by the Baptist Association of Philadelphia, September 25, 1742, and by the Charleston in 1767.* The preface states that the *Confession* was first put forth about the year 1643, by seven congregations then gathered in London, in order to correct mistakes as to the tenets of the societies; when copies of this became scarce, the members finding in their body a general agreement upon most topics with the *Westminster Confession*, adopted its plan and method, and in most instances, its very expressions: hence I may generally state that their doctrine of exclusive salvation is equally illiberal as is that of the *Westminster Confession*: there is, however some mitigation of expression as regards papists; for instance, in chapter xxvi "Of Marriage," the article 3 is the following:

"3. It is lawful for all sorts of people to marry, who are able with judgment to give their consent; yet it is the duty of Christians to marry in the Lord; and therefore such as profess the true religion should not marry with infidels, or idolators; neither should such as are godly be unequally yoked, by marrying with such as are wicked in their life, or maintain damnable heresy."

Here we are not ranked with other idolators, but we find a distinction made between those who hold the true religion and infidels, idolators, or they who maintain damnable heresy: of course a damnable heresy excludes from salvation, so does infidelity and so does idolatry. Therefore the Baptist Church teaches the doctrine of exclusive salvation.

There is also in this *Confession* a very serious difference from the *Westminster Confession* upon the doctrine of predestination: the Baptist is far a milder doctrine upon this head, and approaches much nearer to the Catholic belief: still we are told in chapter xxvii "Of the Church," that the invisible Church consists of the elect. The second article, page 54, is the following:

"2. All persons, throughout the world, professing the faith of the Gospel, and obedience unto God, by Christ, according unto it, not

destroying their own profession by any errors, everting the foundation, or unholiness of conversation, are and may be called visible saints; and of such ought all particular congregations to be constituted."

In the next article we are told that there is a Church of believers and a synagogue of unbelievers.

"3. The purest Churches under heaven are subject to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated as to become no Churches of Christ, but Synagogues of Satan; nevertheless Christ always hath had, and ever shall have, a kingdom in this world, to the end thereof, of such as believe in him, and make profession of his name."

The fourth article is by no means delicate in the denunciation of that Synagogue of Satan, at the head of which is to be found the Pope.

"4. The Lord Jesus Christ is the head of the Church, in whom, by the appointment of the Father, all power for the calling, institution, order or government of the Church, is invested in a supreme and sovereign manner, neither can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof, but is Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God; whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightness of his coming."

Two conclusions are now evidently established, viz. that the maintaining of some errors and heresies are sufficient to exclude from salvation, and next, that the Pope is Antichrist and our Church a Synagogue of Satan. This is indeed very charitable and complimentary and kind.

But let us go a little farther through the document, lest it should be asserted that we did not take a sufficiently extensive view. In page 22, chapter vii, "Of God's Covenant," article two, is the following:

"2. Moreover, man having brought himself under the curse of the law by his fall, it pleased the Lord to make a Covenant of Grace, wherein he freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring faith in him, that they may be saved; and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto eternal life, his Holy Spirit, to make them willing, and able to believe."

The Covenant here is faith, by aid of which man is saved. We shall see the same doctrine in article 3:

"This Covenant is revealed in the Gospel; and was first of all to Adam in the promise of salvation by the seed of the woman, and afterwards by farther steps, until the full discovery thereof was completed in the New Testament; and it is found in that eternal covenant transaction, that was between the Father and the Son about the redemption of the elect; and it is alone by the grace of this Covenant, that all of

the posterity of fallen Adam, that ever were saved, did obtain life and a blessed immortality; man being now utterly incapable of acceptance with God upon those terms on which Adam stood in his state of innocency."

The next article of chapter viii, page 26, shows how faith is communicated to the elect.

"8. To all those for whom Christ hath obtained eternal redemption, he doth certainly and effectually apply, and communicate the same; making intercession for them; uniting them to himself by his Spirit; revealing unto them, in and by the word, the mystery of salvation; persuading them to believe, and obey; governing their hearts by his word and spirit, and overcoming all their enemies by his almighty power and wisdom; in such manner and ways as are most consonant to his wonderful and unsearchable dispensation; and all of free and absolute grace, without any condition foreseen in them, to procure it."

In page 29, we find in chapter x, "Of Effectual Calling," that those in other modes of belief, howsoever moral or just, cannot be saved unless they become Christians, and of course not Roman Catholics, who adhere to Antichrist.

"4. Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the spirit; yet, not being effectually drawn by the Father, they neither will, nor can truly come to Christ; and therefore cannot be saved; much less can men that receive not the Christian religion be saved, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, and the law of that religion they do profess."

In chapter xi, "Of Justification," article 2, we are justified by faith alone.

"2. Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification; yet it is not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but worketh by love."

The same is repeated in the 5th article: but to know the nature of that faith, I shall give you the articles, 2 and 3, of chapter xiv, "Of Saving Faith."

"2. By this faith, a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the word, on the authority of God himself; and also apprehendeth an excellency therein above all other writings; and all things in the world; as it bears forth the glory of God in his attributes, the excellency of Christ in his nature and offices, and the power and fulness of the Holy Spirit in his working and operations; and so is enabled to cast his soul upon the truth thus believed, and also acteth differently

upon that which each particular passage thereof containeth; yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatenings, and embracing the promises of God, for this life, and that which is to come: but the principal acts of saving faith, have immediate relation to Christ, accepting, receiving, and resting upon him alone, for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace.

"3. This faith, although it be different in degrees, and may be weak, or strong, yet it is in the least degree of it, different in the kind, or nature of it, (as is all other saving grace) from the faith and common grace of temporary believers; and therefore, though it may be many times assailed and weakened, yet it gets the victory, growing up in many, to the attainment of a full assurance through Christ, who is both the author and finisher of our faith."

We have now clearly established the fact; that the doctrine of exclusive salvation, "without this our true faith, no person can be saved," is as much a doctrine of the Baptist as it is of the other Churches which I have brought in review before you.

Where the Roman Catholic Church believes that they who die guilty of venial sin alone, will go only to temporary suffering, the Baptist Church teaches that they will be damned perpetually, page 36, chapter xv, "On Repentance unto Life and Salvation, article 5.

"5. Such is the provision which God hath made through Christ in the covenant of grace, for the preservation of believers unto salvation, that although there is no sin so small but it deserves damnation; yet there is no sin so great that it shall bring damnation on them that repent; which makes the constant preaching of repentance necessary."

In page 38, we are taught in chapter xvi, "On good Works," article 7, that "all the works of persons who have not Baptist faith, are sins."

"7. Works done by unregenerate men, although for the matter of them they may be things which God commands and of good use, both to themselves and others; yet because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith, nor are done in a right manner according to the word, nor to a right end, the glory of God, they are sinful and cannot please God, nor make a man meet to receive grace from God: and yet their neglect of them is more sinful and displeasing to God."

This really is a sad dilemma for an unfortunate man. "If you relieve that distressed man you commit a sin, if you neglect it you commit a most grievous offence."

I shall here close for the present this tedious exhibition with the doctrine of the Reformed Dutch Church of the United States of America, as given in its constitution, printed and sold by George Forman, New

York, 1815. I shewed in a former letter that in the xxxviiith of its *Confession of Faith* it was declared that out of the holy congregation of the true Church there is no salvation. I give here now chapter xxix, from page 32:

"*Of the marks of the true Church, and wherein she differs from the false Church.*

"We believe that we ought diligently and circumspectly to discern from the word of God, which is the true Church; since all sects which are in the world assume to themselves the name of the Church. But we speak not here of hypocrites, who are mixed in the Church with the good, yet are not of the Church, though externally in it: but we say that the body and communion of the true church must be distinguished from all sects, who call themselves the Church. The marks, by which the true Church is known, are these: if the pure doctrine of the gospel is preached therein; if she maintains the pure administration of the sacraments as instituted by Christ; if Church discipline is exercised in punishing of sin: in short, if all things are managed according to the pure word of God, all things contrary thereto rejected; and Jesus Christ acknowledged as the only Head of the Church. Hence the true Church may certainly be known; from which no man has a right to separate himself. With respect to those who are members of the Church, they may be known by the marks of christians, namely, by faith; and when they have received Jesus Christ the only Saviour, avoid sin, follow after righteousness, love the true God and their neighbor, neither turn aside to the right or left, and crucify the flesh with the works thereof. But this is not to be understood, as if there did not remain in them great infirmities; but they fight against them through the spirit, all the days of their life, continually taking their refuge to the blood, death, passion, and obedience of our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom they have remission of sins, through faith in him. As for the false Church, she ascribes more power and authority to herself and her ordinances, than to the word of God, and will not submit herself to the yoke of Christ. Neither does she administer the sacraments as appointed by Christ in his word, but adds to, and takes from them, as she thinks proper; she relieth more upon men than upon Christ; and persecutes those, who live holily according to the word of God, and rebuke her for her errors, covetousness, and idolatry. These two Churches are easily known and distinguished from each other."

In this we not only have exclusive salvation, for we are told that the true Church is distinguished from all the sects which assume the name of the Church, that no man has a right to separate himself from

it, that its members are known by faith, and so forth. The calumnies which are cast upon the Roman Catholic Church are given as her characteristics, and she is designed as "a false church," "a persecutor of the saints," "having errors," "being idolatrous," and "being covetous." This is indeed complimentary!

I ask any person who has had the patience to read my four preceeding letters and this present one, whether it is not as extraordinary and ridiculous an exhibition as he has ever known, to find a number of clergymen of Churches professing as their doctrine those tenets, deliberately charge us with being criminals in holding that God has made true faith a requisite for salvation? When our doctrine upon the subject is compared with theirs it is far less harsh, and much milder in its import; for aught that I know they may imagine the Pope to be Antichrist, but it is certainly no great recommendation to their doctrine that it is more harsh and uncharitable than that which is taught by Antichrist himself, and received by the synagogue of Satan, as we are politely and charitably said to be. Do these gentlemen really believe Pope Leo XII is Antichrist? Do they believe sincerely that their fellow-citizens are idolators and constitute a portion of the synagogue of Satan? If they do not, why keep such language in their confessions of Faith? I must continue.

Yours, and so forth,

B. C.

LETTER XXX

CHARLESTON, S. C., Apr. 2, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I shall in this letter endeavor to conclude the testimony of doctrine from the Protestant Churches upon the subject of exclusive salvation. If I have selected some and omitted others, it was not from any predilection or dislike on my part: to me they are all alike, they equally denounce me as a corrupter of the pure doctrine of Christ, and a member of the Church whose errors are too numerous and too gross to allow their fathers to remain in her communion, or to permit them to return without danger of eternal ruin. So far as charity is concerned I hold the individuals of those several Churches upon a perfect equality, and feel convinced that it is my religious duty, as I trust it is my disposition to do them every service in my power, and to meet them in all the relations of society as friends, neighbors, fellow-citizens, or brethren of the human family. It would be too tedious to examine

the doctrine of every denomination, but it was necessary to select a few, and in making the selection, I have as far as I knew, taken the Churches to which those gentlemen belonged who so zealously aided White in his charge against us. As those gentlemen charged us with holding a doctrine which made our very benevolence a curse and rendered us unfit to participate in an equality of political rights, with our fellow-Christians, I thought it to be only just to try themselves by their own test. I believe, that the Methodist doctrine is that which alone of the assailants has not yet been exhibited. Allow me now to dwell for a short time upon their *Confession of Faith.*

The Doctrines and Principles of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the twentieth edition, New York, published by N. Bangs & T. Mason, for the Methodist Episcopal Church. J. C. Totten, printer, 9, Bowery, 1820—shall be my text book.

It is very obvious to all who know any thing of the origin of our several Protestant denominations, that Methodism was originally but a regular and methodical practice of the religious duties of the Church of Protestant England, but in process of time it has come to be a separate denomination, between which and the church whence it emanated there are many things not only discrepant but contradictory: not only things indifferent or upon which there might be difference without breach of communion: but upon what is really, and [is] known to be essential. However, we must necessarily expect to find in many instances a great similarity of doctrine. Hence as we know that the Church of England and the American Protestant Episcopal Church hold the doctrine of exclusive salvation; it must be also held by the Methodist Church unless it has been specially abandoned. As we have no evidence of this special abandonment, we must be of opinion that it continues to be still a tenet of the society. This, though a good presumptive argument, and nearly conclusive as to fact, is not however such ground as I should be willing to rest upon, especially in a case like the present. I shall therefore use positive proof.

To establish my position, will require the attainment of two results: the first, that according to the Methodist Church doctrine, without faith there is no salvation, and secondly, that this faith exists only in those who believe the doctrine of Christ. I shall add another, viz. that Roman Catholics have not that doctrine, and it will follow that Roman Catholics are excluded from salvation.

The work which I shall use contains two parts, the spiritual and the temporal: section ii, of the first part, contains the "Articles of Religion:" they are generally taken from those of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Article v, page 8, corresponds with article vi of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and is in the following words:

"The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

The only difference is in the introducing the particle *The* at the commencement in this, and omitting the particle *the* before *faith.* Hence it is clearly implied if not fully declared; that the belief of an article of faith is necessary to salvation. In page 10, we have the following article VIII "Of Free Will."

"The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and works, to faith, and calling upon God; Wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will."

This is exactly the same as article x of the Protestant Episcopal Church, save that it omits the word good before "works" where it first occurs, and which word good is in the article of the Protestant Episcopal Church. From this article we are necessarily led to infer that our good works depend upon faith, or are identified therewith, and that we cannot obtain this faith, or do those works without the aid of God's grace; indeed the plain meaning is that grace produces faith, and faith produces the works. So that we have no good work without faith as its foundation —hence it is obvious that as we cannot be saved without faith or good works, or both, he who has not faith cannot be saved. The next article removes all doubt from the question, article ix, page 11 "Of the Justification of Man."

"We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works of deserving;—Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most whosesome doctrine and very full of comfort."

This is word for word so far as it has reference to the xith article of the Protestant Episcopal Church; the latter refers to the book of Homilies for an explanation of the manner in which we are justified by faith only, and how it is wholesome and comfortable. My conclusion is, the Methodist Church requires faith for justification, hence either a person might be saved without being justified, or he cannot be saved without having faith: our Methodist friends are far from asserting that an unjustified man can be saved, and they necessarily teach what we have

previously seen to be their doctrine, that only they who have faith will be saved: and this is the doctrine of exclusive salvation in its fullest extent and acceptation. We shall see this further confirmed in the tenth article "Of Good Works."

"Although good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgments: yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and spring out of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be evidently known, as a tree is discerned by its fruit."

The variance between this and the article xii of the Protestant Episcopal Church consists in although being substituted for albeit, the word judgment being made plural, and omitting the word necessarily after spring out. The article in each case exhibits to us good works as the consequence of faith: and in each case shows the necessity of faith for salvation. There is however a wide difference between the substantial doctrine in each, for the Methodist does not assert in this article that good works are a necessary consequence of faith: he here admits the possibility of the existence of faith without being necessarily productive, whereas the Protestant Episcopal Church asserts that the works must necessarily spring out from faith wherever it does exist; they both agree that the exhibition of good works is an evidence of the existence of faith, or belief, without which there is no justification. We next come to page 12, article xiii "Of the Church."

"The visibile Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

This article is alike in both churches, and an essential mark of the Church is that the pure word of God is preached therein. They who will not believe these doctrines cannot have faith, cannot be in that true Church, cannot be justified, cannot be saved. For my own part I can see no ground for saying that any Church or religious society that I ever heard or read of, is not equally chargeable as is ours with holding this doctrine. I shall now proceed to examine a few of the code passages in which the Protestant Episcopal and Methodist Churches apply the principle specially to our Church.

In page 13, article xiv: "Of Purgatory."

"The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardon, worshipping, and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but repugnant to the word of God."

This is also the article xii of the Protestant Episcopal Church. We are here distinctly ejected from the Church, since we teach what is repugnant to the word of God, consequently not the pure word of God, but that which is repugnant thereto, and of course not grounded upon the warrant of Scripture. The next article charges us with what is also said to be repugnant to the word of God, article xiv which is article xxiv of the Protestant Episcopal Church, "Of speaking in the congregation in such a tongue as the People understand."

"It is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the Church, or to minister the sacraments, in a tongue not understood by the people."

Will any person who will peruse this evidence for a moment hesitate to say that we are treated not only very unceremoniously, but very illiberally, by gentlemen whose first principle is, that neither we nor they can know with infallible certainty what is the meaning of the passages of the Bible, and that each person is to seek for knowledge from God and not to depend upon the testimony of any Church, because each Church is liable to err?

In page 14, we are charged with corrupt following of the Apostles; this is in article xvi and corresponds with article xxv of the Protestant Episcopal Church. I really do not understand what the gentlemen mean, unless it be what I cannot believe they intended, that they charge the Apostles with corruption, and consequently that we are criminal in following them. But in page 15, paragraph the second of article xviii, "Of the Lord's Supper," there is another specific opposition to God's pure doctrine charged upon us.

"Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of our Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

This corresponds to article xxviii of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Hitherto we were charged with opposing the word of God, and being superstitious. Now the sounds begin to grow more portentous: our Presbyterian, Baptist, and other friends, not content with this, which in all conscience was severe enough, add "is repugnant to common sense and reason, and hath been and is the cause of gross idolatries." Poor, senseless, Popish Idiots, and gross Idolators! Thank you gentlemen! It becomes you to lecture us and to rebuke us for illiberality. Let us, however, hear a little more to soothe our pride and excite our vanity. In page 16, article xix, the Methodist Church has, "Of both kinds."

"The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people: for both

the parts of the Lord's Supper, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be administered to all Christians alike."

The Protestant Episcopal Church has the word *sacrament* for *supper*. The declaration herein contained is that communion under one kind is contrary to the ordinance and commandment of Christ; of course then we are charged with this criminality. In the same page, article xx agrees word for word with article xxvi of the Protestant Episcopal Church, except that the verbs which I have put in *italics* are in the past tense there; here they are in the present, and the fable and deceit here, are there in the plural: "Of the one oblation of Christ, finished upon the Cross."

"The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of masses, in which it *is* commonly said, that the Priest *doth* offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, *is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit.*"

Our friends of the Reformed Dutch Church, at the conclusion of their xxxvth article, have this passage for our benefit:

"Therefore we reject all mixtures and *damnable inventions* which men have added unto, or blended with the sacraments."

And in the *Catechism* for the xxx Lord's Day, page 58, Q. 80, we are further complimented:

"Q. 80. What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Popish Mass?

"A. The Lord's Supper testifies to us, that we have a full pardon of all sin by the only sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which he himself has once accomplished on the cross; and, that we, by the Holy Ghost, are ingrafted into Christ, who, according to the human nature, is now not on earth, but in heaven, at the right hand of God his Father, and will there be worshipped by us; *but the mass teacheth that the living and dead have not the pardon of sins through the sufferings of Christ, unless Christ is also daily offered for them by the Priests*; and further, that Christ is bodily under the form of bread and wine, and therefore is to be worshipped in them; so that *the mass* at bottom, *is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ*, and an accursed idolatry."

The good gentlemen will please to allow me to know what the mass is; and with that knowledge I beg leave to inform them that I do not believe even White himself would have been so barefaced as to assert that the propositions which I have marked in *italics* in the answer which they

teach their children are true. Roman Catholics do not teach either of those two propositions, and the mass teaches nothing. Our Baptist brethren, page 61, kindly join our Presbyterian brethren in the following assertion, chapter xxix, article 2:

"So that Popish sacrifice of the mass, as they call it, is most abominably injurious to Christ's own and only sacrifice, the alone propitiation for the sins of the elect."

The Methodist, in page 45, prescribing the trial for candidates for the ministry, in answer 2, places a requisite condition "a just conception of salvation by faith," and at an ordination of an elder, page 141, requires him to be "ready with faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word;" and in ordaining a Bishop, page 154, requires of him, in addition, to promise "both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same."

I have been tedious, but upon this topic I have done for the present. I believe then, it must appear extraordinary that clergymen of those several Churches should have combined to unite with the writer of the *Evidence* in the following paragraph:

"If your leaders, whom it would be uncharitable to suspect of the latter feeling, have so far receded from the Roman creed as to allow us the common privileges of Christianity, and can conscientiously swear to protect and encourage the interests of the Church of England, let them, in the name of truth, speak openly before the world, and be the first to remove that obstacle to mutual benevolence, and perfect community of political privileges—the doctrine of exclusive salvation in your Church. Cancel but that one article in your creed, and all liberal men in Europe will offer you the right hand of fellowship. Your doctrines concern yourselves; this endangers the peace and freedom of every man living, and that in proportion to your goodness: it makes your very benevolence a curse."

My friends, we have too long suffered under injuries and unfounded imputations: we have been accustomed to hear ourselves vilified as the only tolerant Church in Christendom, as the only Church which taught the doctrine of exclusive salvation; we ought not to permit this any longer —without any diminution of charity, without any violation of friendship, without any loss of affection for our brethren of other Churches, let us make them feel that we are at least as liberal as any of them. I am fully aware that several who hail under the names of those Churches will answer, that they do not believe all the doctrines which those Churches teach. But surely the clergy will not say so; they at all events

believe what they profess to teach, and of course they believe this doctrine. When the other gentlemen shall have determined upon what they will please to believe, and give us an exhibition of their tenets, we shall be able to make the case as plain in their regard provided they go but one line beyond this position. Every person, good and bad, that ever was created will be saved, without any endurance of punishment: and truth and error are equally acceptable to God: neither does he take into account whether a person has been indifferent to the discovery of truth, or engaged in its investigation, nor whether he has made it the rule of his conduct, or been careless as to what rule he observed. The least advance beyond this line is embracing a doctrine of exclusive salvation.

I shall proceed to examine the other portions of the *Evidence.*

Yours, and so forth,

B. C.

LETTER XXXI

CHARLESTON, S. C., Apr. 9, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I have, I trust, fully established the following points: viz. 1. That a doctrine of exclusive salvation is taught by every religious society. 2. That the Roman Catholic Church did not drive out the Protestant sectaries, because of their refusal to abandon the doctrines which their predecessors had given them, as derived from the Apostles. 3. That the first Protestants went out from the Roman Catholic Church, because she would not abandon the doctrines which she had received from the Apostles through their successors, and which Roman Catholics also believed to be in accordance with the Scriptures. 4. That the persons who so left the Roman Catholic Church, asserted that she erred in keeping those doctrines, and that their regard for the salvation of their souls and the purity of their religion obliged them to leave her communion. 5. That this is on their part an assertion that only they who reject false doctrine and adhere to the pure and true doctrine can be saved. 6. That they have separated from each other into a vast number of sects and divisions, each of which denounces the rest as erroneous in one or more points of doctrine, and justifies its separation upon the ground of the high obligation of adhering to truth and rejecting error. 7. That they all denounce the Roman Catholic Church as bigoted and intolerant and tyrannical, for not admitting as true, a principle whose truth they all deny, viz. that it is a matter of indifference in the sight of God whether a person adheres to religious truth or to

religious error, provided he is a good, moral man. 8. That whilst they complain of being styled heretics or choosers of doctrines, by the Roman Catholic Church, they feel themselves justified in calling her a corrupter of God's word, the false Church, a lying harlot, the synagogue of satan, the scarlet . . . . of Babylon; her members idolators; her clergy, lying prophets, wolves in sheep's clothing, imps of the devil; and their chief Bishop, Antichrist, the man of sin, the son of perdition. 9. That this unbecoming language is not only that of ages gone by, but that of the present day; not that which is used in a moment of irritation, but in the hours of deliberate and most solemn and serious reflection; not by the rabble drawcansirs, who seek for temporary notice and a daily morsel, without any farther hopes, but by dignified prelates, learned ministers, wise elders, provident deacons, and grave synods; it is language embodied in the awful formularies of Faith, for the edification of the sanctimonious, for the direction of the preacher, for the information of the inquirer, and to be used in the formation of the youthful mind, even from the first lispings of artless and unsuspecting infancy.

Yes, my friends, whilst the Church of Bishop Kemp, and those of his associates, use such language as this, they dare before a judicious public to arraign us who have not returned railing for their railing, or reproach for their scoffing, though they have thus denounced us in their doctrinal works. I have never known effrontery to equal that of which those Right Reverend and reverend approvers of the Reverend Joseph Blanco White are guilty. They may, if they will, set to work upon the amendment and revision of their doctrinal formularies, they may, if they will, make their religion more pure; with all this we have no concern; but we should not suffer them with impunity to charge us with holding a more intolerant doctrine than they do, when in truth ours is more liberal, than is the most liberal of theirs.

I have done for the present with the doctrine of exclusive salvation; not that I have exhausted my topics, but that I fear having tired my readers. Should the holy alliance of our opponents desire it, they shall be treated to as much more as they be pleased to call for: I have it made up by me, ready to order.

White now passes to another topic, page 72.

"Believe a man who has spent the best years of his life where Catholicism is professed without the check of dissenting opinions; where it luxuriates on the soil, which fire and sword have cleared of whatever might stunt its natural and genuine growth; a growth incessantly watched over by the head of your Church, and his authorized representatives, the Inquisitors."

This portion of the chapter, according to its heading in the title, I expected, would give us abundant evidence of all the atrocities of the Inquisition, and I therefore looked for an opportunity of giving a correct statement of the nature of that institution; but really there is so little upon the subject, that I must leave that history to another place, in which it shall be more appropriately introduced. After I shall have concluded my examination of White's *Evidence*, I have by me another work, in the examination of which it will be more properly given.

White calls upon us to believe him. Believe whom?—Look to my Letters V, VI, and so forth, and will you believe him?—"Spain has cleared the soil with fire and sword." At all events, the Inquisition was no sword; the Kings of Spain used it in their wars with the Moors; but in the name of common sense why are we to be made accountable for the regulations by which the Spanish government secured itself against the secret attempts of an enemy which had long kept its people in bondage, and which now nearly driven out by the sword, sought to insinuate itself concealed in the country, to make new attempts at its subjugation? Let me put a case, which being of times now before us, will be better understood, and will perhaps even justify the Spanish policy. Suppose the cause of Greece triumphant; would our American patrons of Blanco White condemn the policy which would exclude the Turks from that liberated country over which they had so long domineered? Would they condemn the policy which dreading the return of those oppressors, would create a tribunal to inquire after such as might remain concealed or disguised and watching for a favorable opportunity of again subjugating their former tributaries? Yet this would be exactly what White calls clearing the soil with the sword in the first instance, and if the tribunal punished with death by burning those discovered enemies, it would be clearing it by fire. This was the origin of the Spanish Inquisition, a tribunal created in 1480, by Ferdinand and Isabella, to guard their territories against the return of Saracenic dominion. Neither were the Spanish Inquisitors the "authorized representatives of the head of our Church." The King of Spain named the Inquisitor general for all his territories; this name was transmitted to the Pope for his approbation; the local Inquisitors were nominated by this general, but they had no power in virtue of this nomination, until it was approved of and confirmed by the King: the monarch also appointed a council to sit with the Inquisitor general, and by the King's authority familiars or officers of the local tribunals were appointed from amongst the nobility, by the supreme council: thus it was not a tribunal of authorized representatives of the Pope, but of the Spanish monarch, and was established not against

heretics, but against the ancient Saracenic enemies of the Spanish people. The King of Spain seeing the desolating wars of Germany and the convulsions of France, in consequence of the change of religion, and having unity and peace at home, charged the same tribunal to prevent the introduction into their territories of those strife-creating factions which tortured the minds and afflicted the bodies of other nations; they believed that the way to heaven was open to the professors of the ancient religion, and they saw no necessity for introducing theological discord and tumultous wranglers into a land which was now enjoying some repose, It is indeed extraordinary that White should scarcely ever give even a coloring of truth to his statements. His book was written in the year 1825, at a period when the Inquisition did not exist, when he well knew there was no such tribunal in Spain, and yet he tells us that "the growth of Catholicism is watched over by the head of our Church, and his authorized representatives the Inquisitors."

I have in a former letter taken to pieces the fable which he gives us in page 73, concerning his mother and the Inquisition. I shall not therefore now revert to it; but shall hasten to the conclusion of this his second letter, page 74.

"Such is the spirit of ecclesiastical power to which you submit. The monstrous laws of which I speak, do not belong to a remote period: they existed in full force fifteen years ago: they were republished, under the authority of the Pope, at a later period."

But Mr. White here asserts a deliberate falsehood. His letter is addressed to the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, and the power which he describes is that of the Spanish Inquisition, which has never been in force in Great Britain or Ireland. As well might he tell the Irish Catholics that the King of Spain could nominate the archbishop of Armagh because the Pope consented to his nominating the archbishop of Toledo: as well might he have asserted that the Church lands in Ireland belong to the Catholic Bishops, because the King of Spain agreed with the Pope that the Church lands of his dominions should belong only to Roman Catholics. This is the discreditable sophistry of endeavoring to establish general conclusions as the result of special premises. I would be just as well warranted in charging the Protestant Bishops of America with voting the persecution of the Irish Catholics. There is here also a wilful concealment of the truth: viz. that the tribunal has been abolished, and that the Pope refused to be concerned in its restoration—page 75,

"If some of your writers assume the tone of freedom which belongs to this age and country; if you profess your Faith without compulsion;

you may thank the Protestant laws which protect you. Is there a spot in the universe where a Roman Catholic may throw off his mental allegiance except where Protestants have contended for that right, and sealed it with their blood?''

Of all the barefaced effrontery which ever was possessed by any writer, the compiler of this passage must have had the greatest share; or he must be the most ignorant man who has attempted to treat of such a subject. He is addressing the Roman Catholics of Ireland whose predecessors have written at several periods, during centuries before they were persecuted for adhering to their religion, with the same freedom that they do now: to men whose fathers when they professed their faith before Protestants existed did so without compulsion; the same is true of the British Catholics. They were Catholics who refused to permit the Popes to interfere with their national rights, with the provisions of the Great Charter, who proclaimed that they would not have the laws of England changed, who passed the statutes of *Mortmain* and of *Praemunire*. Is it possible that the sponsors of White can, even in America, assert without blushing that the British and Irish Catholics may now thank the disgraceful code of Protestant laws by which they are persecuted for their religion, for the ability to confess their faith without compulsion? There never existed a law in Ireland to compel a man to profess any faith or system or religion, until Protestant laws were made to compel Catholics to profess the Protestant religion, and torture them if they refused. Will Bishop Kemp have the goodness to produce the law if it existed? or state a single instance of persecution upon the score of religion in Ireland until the time of King Henry VIII, whom God raised up as he did Josias, and Ezechias?

Protestants never contended for the right of conscience in Naples, and never sealed it with their blood in that region or in Sicily, nor in the States of the Church, nor in Brazil: yet in these and several other spots of the universe, Roman Catholics may and do leave their Church, and openly profess having thrown off their mental allegiance. Thus every particle of this paragraph, is a tissue of untruth and unblushing effrontery. One would imagine by his style and manner that he felt confident that Protestants never interfered with the freedom of conscience. What does he say to the penal laws whose continuance and whose enforcement he advocates? Could George IV throw off his mental allegiance, for I will not charge him with the imitation of White's own hypocrisy, without losing his crown? Could Mr. Canning hold his place as Secretary of State if he became a Roman Catholic? Could the Lord Mayor of London wear his golden chain if he became a Roman Catholic? Could

the Duke of Sussex vote in the house of Peers if he became a Roman Catholic? Could Sir Francis Burdett or Mr. Brougham retain their seats in the House of Commons if they became Roman Catholics? Could the Duke of Wellington retain his office of commander-in-chief, or could Marquis Wellesley retain the government of Ireland, if they became Roman Catholics? Could Sir Wm. M'Mahon keep his place as Master of Rolls in Ireland, if he professed the religion of his parents and of his youth? Could the beadle of any hall in a British or Irish University, could the lowest officer of the meanest corporation retain his place and change his religion?—Why did the Swiss Protestant canton turn Mr. Haller, but three years since, from his place in her council? Because he took the liberty of changing his religion and returning to the Church of his ancestors.

"I know that your Church modifies her intolerance according to circumstances, and that she tolerates in France, after the revolution, the Huguenots, whom she would have burnt in Spain a few years ago, and whom she would doom to some indefinite punishment, little short of the stake, at this present moment. Such conduct is unworthy of the claims which Rome contends for, and would disgrace the more obscure leader of a paltry sect. If she still claims the right of wielding 'the sword of Peter,' why does she conceal it under her mantle? If not, why does she not put an end to more than half the miseries and degradation of Italy, Spain, Portugal and Spanish America, by at once declaring that men are accountable only to God for their religious belief, and that sincere and conscientious persuasion must both in this and the next world, be a valid plea for the pardon of error? Does the Church of Rome really profess this doctrine?—It is then the sacred duty for her to remove at once that scandal of Christianity, that intoleranace which the conduct of Popes and councils has invariably upheld."

Upon what does this rhapsody rest? Upon a false assumption, viz. that the Roman Catholic Church has done what she has not done: that is, that she has enacted the civil laws of the various nations in which her faith was professed. She neither tolerates the Huguenots in France, nor has she desired to burn him in Spain, and she has no punishment to inflict upon him. She asserts that he has departed from the doctrines which his father received from the Apostles, and that his tenets are not comformable to those which came down from the beginning. She wields indeed the sword of Peter, but not to cut off the ear of Malchus, for such is not her commission, but to cut off from her communion those who would corrupt her doctrine, or rebel against the authority committed

by Christ to those whom the Holy Ghost has placed as governors in the Church of God.

For my part, I cannot see either misery or degradation in any place equal to that which exists in Ireland, in consequence of the unholy effort which the British Church and State have made to force a people to act against her conscience. Will Bishop Kemp have the kindness to exhibit to me any thing to equal what I produce? As to the next part, the Church of Rome admits the principle with its proper restrictions; but she denies that this sincere conviction upon sufficient grounds, exists in those cases where White assumes that it does, and I deny the fact which White impliedly asserts, "that the conduct of Popes and Councils has invariably upheld such intolerance as is the scandal of Christianity." It is not my duty to prove a negative, but I am ready to meet any one who undertakes to prove the affirmative, and to give him sufficient returns for any instances which he might adduce.

"But if, as I am persuaded, Rome still thinks in conformity with her former conduct, and yet the Roman Catholics of these kingdoms dissent from her on this point; they have already begun to use the Protestant right of private judgment upon one of the articles of their faith; and I may hope they will follow me in the examination of that alleged divine authority, by which they are prevented from extending it to all."

This is again begging the question, and assuming the truth of what is untrue. The Catholics of Ireland and Britain do not dissent from the doctrines of their Church upon that point, but they adhere thereto; and White misrepresents and involves [the question], and after having endeavored to render it obscure, states that which is not the fact.

He appends a note to this letter, to show that the friar Alphonsus de Castro, who preached against the persecution of the English Protestants, under Mary, wrote a book, to prove that the laws which enacted civil and canonical punishment against heretics were just; and that the Fourth Council of Toledo was not as liberal as Mr. Charles Butler says it was. With respect to the friar, it is matter of notoriety, and admitted history, that he preached against persecution. When the good sponsors of White will adduce a single passage from his book to contradict the doctrine of his sermon, it will be time enough for me to reply to their assertions. Let them produce the laws which he defends. With respect to the Council of Toledo, it was a mere question between Mr. Butler and White, in his mode of treating which, White shows his own dishonesty. In his *Evidence*, he, as I have shown, endeavors to conclude, from the establishment of the Inquisition against the Moors and Jews, that every Catholic country held the same principle,

and that it was enforced by the Catholic Church against all dissenters from her body. But in page 238, he discovers, for his own purposes, the distinction which I have drawn, and protests against Mr. Butler's deducing a general conclusion from a mere Spanish case; and founds his explanation of a notorious fact upon the surmise of his own opinion, and the induction of his own probability, page 239. I shall not now, however, follow him into the explanation of a special case of Spanish discipline, as my object is not to vindicate the kingdom of Spain, but the Catholic Church; and the Council of Toledo is not a General Council.

Upon the postscript to this letter, I shall make a very short remark:

"*Postscript.*—Want of books, or rather want of sufficient health to undergo the fatigue and discomfort of consulting them in public libraries, had made me proceed in the composition of these *Letters*, deriving the materials from my own stores, and from the book itself, against the general tendency of which I was induced to take up the pen. My knowledge of the Roman Catholic doctrines led me soon to conclude that Mr. Butler was a writer who, on the fairest construction, knew how to divert his adversaries from all the weak points of his cause. Yet I trusted that the accuracy of his quotations might be depended upon, especially when he gave us authorized statements of the Roman Catholic Tenets. The translation of the creed of Pius IV, which Mr. Butler inserted in his *Book of the Roman Catholic Church*, was, therefore, the only document of that kind from which I deduced my arguments, to prove the duty incumbent on Roman Catholics to propagate their religion by every means in their power. Whether I have succeeded or failed in proving that fact by inference, my readers will decide. But, upon a revision of my arguments, I do not regret that an omission, which I subsequently discovered, in Mr. Butler's translation of that creed, deprived me, at first, of the easiest and most direct proof which I could wish to support my assertion. For had I consulted the original at once, the positive confirmation which that document gives it, and my own familiar conviction of its truth, would have induced me to save myself the exertion of fully developing my argument. As it now happens, I flatter myself that my readers will give me some credit for accuracy in the knowledge of the Roman Catholic doctrines, when they shall see that a theoretical reasoning from her established general principles, fully and accurately agrees with a positive injunction of the Church of Rome, of which lapse of time had made me forget the existence.

"Let us, then, compare the last article in Mr. Butler's translation of the creed, with the original.

"Mr. Butler's translation: 'This true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved, which I now freely profess, and truly hold, I, N., promise, vow, and swear most constantly to hold and profess the same whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life. Amen.'

"The Latin original: '*Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in praesenti sponte profiteor, et veraciter teneo, eandem integram, et inviolatam, usque ad extremum vitae spatium constantissime* (*Deo adjuvante*) *retinere et confiteri*, ATQUE A MEIS SUBDITIS, VEL ILLIS QUORUM CURA AD ME IN MUNERE MEO SPECTABIT, TENERI, DOCERI, ET PRAEDICARI, QUANTUM IN ME ERIT, CURATURUM EGO IDEM N. SPONDEO, VOVEO, AC JURO.'

"Now, the words in SMALL CAPITALS, omitted by Mr. Butler, contain the very pith and marrow of the strongest argument against the admissibility of Roman Catholics to parliament. For if the most solemn profession of their faith lays on every one of her members who enjoys a place of influence, the duty of 'procuring' that all under him, by virtue of his office, shall hold, teach, and *preach* the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, and this under an oath and vow; how can such men engage to preserve the ascendancy of the Church of England in these realms.

"When, in the *New Times* of the 5th of April, I exposed this important omission before the public, I thought that Mr. Butler would have explained the origin of it. But I am not aware of his having given any explanation. Neither on that, nor on the present occasion, is it my intention to cast a suspicion on that gentleman's good faith? He probably copied from some garbled translation, prepared by less scrupulous members of his communion, who wished to conceal the real tenets of their Church from a Protestant public. At all events, this fresh instance in inaccuracy, on a most important thing, gives additional propriety to caution in reading Mr. Butler's defence of Catholicism."

A more glaring untruth never was put forward than that which is here asserted, in two instances. He charges Mr. Charles Butler with having given as an exhibition of the Catholic tenets, a garbled document, by omitting an essential part. That part which he says was suppressed by Mr. Butler, he gives at full length. Now, that addition which he gives, contains no expression of any tenet, but is a promise and oath given by certain persons, to teach and to have taught the tenets which had been previously expressed and enumerated by Mr. Butler, therefore, when they had been so expressed and enumerated,

there was no garbling of the document in the translation, by any member of our communion, who wished to conceal the real tenets of our Church from a Protestant public. In the next place, the oath is no part of the tenets, and is not to be found in the creed. The original has not the oath or promise. The last clause in the original is exactly that which Mr. Butler has given before the passage, which is here stated as the last article given by Mr. Butler, and which, in fact, is no article, except in its first sentence, which is that concerning exclusive salvation: but to this is appended a form of promise always made and sometimes sworn to; for the words "vow and swear," are generally omitted; they are never used, except upon some very extraordinary occasion, such as the reconciliation of apostates to the Church. But the question recurs, did White forget the clause which he says was omitted? No; but by a sort of deceit, which is highly censurable, he exhibits as an article of the faith of every Roman Catholic, and sworn to by every Roman Catholic, that oath which a Bishop swears after making the profession previously to his consecration.

But this is not all; for as the words evidently imply that this oath binds a person in office, to see that all under his charge shall hold, teach, and preach the recited doctrines; he with equal want of principle and decency, concludes that it would bind a British Member of Parliament, by virtue of that office or place, to use his best efforts to make the Protestant clergy preach and teach the Catholic tenets! And, thus, he endeavors to support his previous calumnies of our disregard for oaths, or of the obligation of Catholic legislators robbing Protestant Churches. The Church does not require that the oath shall be taken by such legislator, and therefore the whole postscript is an unbecoming falsehood, and of a piece with the rest of the book. How could Bishop Kemp and his associates, before the civilized world, give the sanction of their names to the truth of those assertions? As well might I assert, that no member of the Protestant Episcopal Church ought to be permitted to take his seat in our Congress, or State Legislatures, or that he could not, with a safe conscience, take such seat, if elected thereto, because the Bishops of his Church on the day of their consecration make a solemn declaration, equivalent to an oath, that they will with all faithful diligence banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's word; and both privately and openly call upon and encourage others to the same.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXXII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Apr. 16, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—Hitherto White's remarks were upon topics more of a political and personal than of a dogmatic description; his third letter however is more than the others, that of which the gentlemen of "the holy alliance" should naturally be esteemed competent judges, and for whose untruths or misrepresentations they are individually and collectively as amenable to us and to the public, as is White himself. We can excuse them for much, and only condemn their rashness and disposition to do us an unkindness, when they undertake to unite with Irish Orangemen and British persecutors, in lecturing British and Irish Catholics for their endeavors to regain their seats in their own legislative assemblies; and when they paint us who are Catholics, to our fellow citizens, as persons sworn to violate the constitution of this Union, and those of our States, by abusing the confidence of our constituents, should we be chosen to office or to seats in the legislatures. We could even smile at their credulity, if we thought they really believed what their friend, Blanco White, wrote concerning the situation of religion in Spain. But for their approbation of the *Third Letter*, the gentlemen must stand or fall upon their own merits. Its title is as follows:—

"Examination of the title to infallibility, spiritual supremacy, and exclusive salvation, claimed by the Roman Catholic Church. Internal evidence against Rome, in the use she has made of her assumed prerogative. Short method of determining the question."

As theologians, the gentlemen must be presumed to have studied our arguments in support of the doctrine of infallibility, before they pronounced those arguments to be insufficient: for we cannot suppose them to have solemnly protested before God and the world, that this doctrine was erroneous, until they were fully acquainted with all that is adduced to prove its truth. If therefore they suppress any of those arguments, when they state the reasons by which we uphold the tenet, for the purpose of refuting them, they have been guilty of that which I need not describe. They have identified themselves with White; his words therefore must be considered as theirs. His letter commences with the following passage:

"At the conclusion of my preceding *Letter*, I entreated you to examine the title by which your Church deprives her members of the right of private judgment on religious matters, and denies salvation to those

who venture to think for themselves. In making this request I may appear to have overlooked the very essence of your religious allegiance, and to demand a concession which would at once put you out of the pale of the Roman Church. But I beg you to observe, that whatever be the extent of the authority of that Church over you, there is one point which it cannot withhold from the judgment and verdict of your reason. The reality of her title to be the guide and rule of your faith, must be a matter, not of authority, but of proof. He that claims obedience in virtue of delegated power, is bound to prove his appointment. Any attempt to deprive those who, without that appointment would be his equals, of the liberty to examine the authority, nature and extent of the decree which constitutes the delegate above them; is an invasion of men's natural liberty, as well as a strong indication of imposture. If before we come to God we must, through nature, believe that he is, surely before we yield our reason to one who calls himself God's Vicar, our reason should be satisfied that God has truly appointed him to that supereminent post."

For the phrase "who think for themselves" would be much more correctly substituted "who select from the body of revealed doctrines some which they choose to retain, whilst they reject the remainder as not suiting their taste." It is impossible to prevent a man's thinking for himself; and he who believes every doctrine of the Church upon her testimony, exercises this right as well and more judiciously than does the person who selects for himself: because all revealed doctrines are believed upon the authority of testimony, and that man who examines the credibility of the witness, and is satisfied of the existence of those characteristics which make him competent and credible, has necessarily thought for himself during this examination; but when the authority of that witness is fully established, the selection of some portions of her testimony is not thinking judiciously, but choosing arbitrarily: and hence the person who so chooses is called Algerixos, *a chooser*. The right of private judgment as to the character of the witness must necessarily precede the decision upon her authority, but that authority once recognized, it would be a contradiction to suppose a right of choice to remain: the co-existence of authorized testimony, and of a right of choice, is impossible. The Catholic Church does not therefore deprive her members of the right of private judgment upon her own character as an authorized witness: nor does she deny salvation to those who think for themselves; but she teaches that they who choose for themselves, do, by so acting, contradict the first principles of reason, and the first maxims of religion.

Had the writer laid down these maxims without having had recourse to that sophistry of language, which in the very choice of its expressions begs the question in debate, I should without any remark, have admitted his position, that "the reality of the title of the Roman Catholic Church to be the guide and rule of our faith, must be a matter not of authority but of proof," as I would also have granted him the proposition which precedes that statement.

I have here to expose another of those subterfuges which the writer has frequent recourse to in the process of his work, the use of ambiguous phrases, so as to destroy the distinction between objects which are very unlike. It is observable that many of our opponents in speaking of our Church, call it the "Roman Church," others the "Romish Church," and others the "Church of Rome." I am aware that in a great many cases it is caused by pure unmixed ignorance, in others by dislike and bigotry, but many use it more for the purposes of sophistry. This latter description of persons know that the Roman Church, or the Church of Rome, is only the diocese which is superintended by the Pope as an individual Bishop: that the Catholic Church is spread throughout the world, but as in several parts of the world there are separatists of various descriptions, who claim to be portions of the Catholic Church, those Catholics who are in communion with the See or Church of Rome, and who acknowledge it to be the mother and mistress of all other Churches, are designated by the addition of the prænomen Roman, and therefore, that although the Roman Catholic Church is spread through the whole world, the Church of Rome does not extend beyond the walls of that city. White here tells the persons whom he addresses, as "the impartial amongst the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland," that a certain concession would at once put them "out of the pale of the Roman Church." This is just as if Bishop Kemp should tell me who am a citizen of Charleston, that doing a certain act would put me out of the citizenship of Baltimore, of which place I never was a citizen. If the Roman Catholic who resides in the archdiocese of Dublin, should remove his residence to the diocese of Rome, he would be immediately recognized and received, because of his quality of Roman Catholic, and would become a member of the Roman Church, ceasing to be a member of the Church of Dublin; as the Bishop, if he is an American citizen would be received and admitted a member of our city, upon his coming hither and ceasing to be a citizen of Baltimore. Thus every member of the Roman Church is a Roman Catholic, but very few Roman Catholics are members of the Roman or Romish Church, or Church of Rome. Having thus adverted to the manner in which the terms are confounded,

I shall only lay down the general principle upon which we may frequently detect the sophistry. Our opponents prove that some act has been done by the Roman Church, and charge it upon the Roman Catholic Church, and thus draw an universal conclusion from particular premises; which is just as fair a mode of reasoning, as if I was to charge the murder of Morgan the freemason, upon all the freemasons in the world, Christians, Jews, Turks, Indians, and all others of the fraternity.

I will not quarrel with the amplification which goes to exhibit what I before admitted "the reality of her title to be the guide and rule of your faith, must be matter not of authority but of proof—" the word her refers to that Church; that Church again is of no meaning, unless it refers to your Church, which depriving the members of their right of private judgment, asserts her title to be the guide, and so forth. Thus the question which in this case is proposed, for examination, is the title of the Church of the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland; the Church to which they submit is not the Roman Church, but the Roman Catholic Church, spread through the whole world, and which they profess to be for them an infallible guide to the faith; her rule of faith they look upon to be correct. White sets out with a promise to examine the proof of the reality of her title. And he does not even touch upon the examination! ! ! Even in this first sentence of his letter he thrice changes the very state of the question. He first gives us the Roman Catholic Church, then the Roman Church, he returns to the Roman Catholic Church, or he states what is not true; and last of all he undertakes to examine, not the proofs of the infallibility of the Church, either Roman or Roman Catholic, but whether God has truly appointed as his Vicar, one who calls himself such, and to whom we are called upon to yield our reason. And this is theology! ! ! Verily it might pass at Oxford, but no degree would be conferred at Seville for such theology as this! In the name of common sense are those two questions the same? 1. Is the Roman Catholic Church an infallible guide to the knowledge of what God has revealed? 2. Ought we yield our reason to one who calls himself God's Vicar? For my part I think they are as far asunder as the poles: and I should first like to know whether there ever was an individual who called himself God's Vicar, whilst he demanded the sacrifice of reason: I avow myself to be one who never heard of such a claim having been made, and who am not prepared to make the sacrifice. My reason teaches me that I ought to believe the doctrines of God, and that I shall infallibly arrive at their knowledge by the testimony of the Roman Catholic Church, and in receiving that testi-

mony, I do not yield my reason, but I act conformably to its clearest dictates.

White proceeds to state his case after having slabbered through his preliminary sentence—

"How then stands the case between the Church of Rome and the world?

"The Church of Rome proclaims that Jesus Christ, both God and man, having appeared on earth for the salvation of mankind, appointed the Apostle Peter to be his representative; made him the head of all the members of his Church then existing; and granted a similar privilege to Peter's successors. Christ ensured an infallible knowledge of the sense of the Scriptures, and an equally infallible knowledge of certain traditions, and their true meaning. On the strength of this divine appointment, the Church of Rome demands the same faith in the decisions of her head, when approved 'by the tacit assent or open consent of the greatest part of her Bishops,' as if they proceeded from the mouth of Christ himself. The divine commission, on which she grounds these claims, runs in these words of Christ to the chief of his Apostles: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' "

This sentence I divide into three parts, and I deny the correctness of the preliminary allegation, viz. that the question is between the Church of Rome and the world: the parties are by no means properly designated. The first party is not the Church of Rome, but is the Roman Catholic Church: the second party is not the world, but is the congregation of all the different sorts of sectaries which have ever separated from the Catholic Church, from the followers of Ebion, or Nicholas, or Cerinthus, or Simon Magus, down to the last denomination, whatever it may be, which has raised a pulpit for its peculiar teacher. I assert that the Roman Catholic Church has in her communion at least one hundred and fifty millions of the present inhabitants of the world: they must be deducted from Blanco White's world. We must next deduct a much larger number who have no share whatever in the contest, who know nothing of the question, who therefore are not parties in the case; the bulk of the inhabitants of China, of Japan, of India, of Persia, of Thibet, of Tartary, of Arabia, of Turkey, of Africa. After making this deduction, we shall have but a very small portion of the world, and from even this we must deduct the Israelites, and pure Deists. We

shall have the Greek Church, which is separated from the communion of Rome, together with the miserable remnants of Nestorians, Eutychians, Macedonians, Sabellians, Arians, Monothelites, and the Russian established Church: to these I add all the various descriptions of Protestants; and I believe I overrate their amount in making the entire of those who profess the Christian religion, but are not Roman Catholics, sum up at seventy-five millions. Thus an accurate and honest writer would have commenced, by stating that the parties in the case were the Roman Catholic Church on the one side, and all other denominations on the other: and he would have added, if he desired to be exact in his statement, that although their aggregate did not exceed half the number of the Roman Catholics, this was the only case in the whole range of doctrine, upon which they could possibly be brought in array together against her:—on every other point they waged war upon each other, a large portion of them upon every other question voting in support of the Roman Catholic tenets, and condemning as erroneous those with whom they now united for the moment. Thus he would have stated, upon this question, the fact that this is Christ's doctrine, is supported by the testimony of all Christendom, with a majority of two to one, and in every other doctrinal question, with a much greater majority; and thus instead of coming to the examination with that prejudice which is excited by the wrong description of the parties at issue, the readers of the *Evidence* would not only have that prejudice removed, but would be led to ask themselves this question, "Has the majority been always at the same side?" To which I assert, the history of the Christian Church would have answered, "Yes." I would then leave to their own fate the following questions: "And is it possible that at all times the majority of the Christian world were ignorant of the true Christian doctrine?" "And upon what rational grounds shall I follow the testimony of the minority, or of some subdivision of that minority, or my own individual conjecture, in opposition to the testimony of the great body of Christians?"

The first proposition of White's sentence is that the Roman Catholic Church teaches the supremacy of St. Peter, and his successors, to the end of the world. The second proposition is, that Christ promised, according to the doctrine of that Church, a certain specified infallibility to the Church, united under Peter and his successors. The corollary from this second proposition is stated to be that the Roman Catholic Church demands acquiescence to her decisions, when made in a specified manner—and the third proposition is, that the only proof of this commission is the words quoted, as spoken by Christ to the chief of his Apostles.

I will admit the truth of the first proposition. In viewing the second, I find White to be grossly incorrect in these expressions, "An infallible knowledge of certain traditions, and their true meaning." I shall allow the corollary, but his third proposition is altogether incorrect.

There is a wide distinction to be taken between a certainty that we are to receive the testimony of true doctrine with infallible correctness from a designated witness, and a certainty of the special mode by which that witness will give that infallibly correct testimony, or obtain the knowledge necessary to give such testimony. When the people of Israel beheld the miracles which Moses wrought, they had the testimony of heaven, and of course the utmost certainty that he was to declare to them the truth of God: the object of the Lord being to make him a witness, whose testimony would give them infallibly correct knowledge of the will of God. Nothing more was necessary than the declaration, on the part of the Most High, that his will would be taught by Moses. Whether the Lord gave the knowledge to Moses by inspiration, or by conversation, or by writing, or by vision, or by strengthening his natural powers of reasoning, made no difference: still he was the authorized interpreter of the will of Heaven; for God had declared that he had commissioned him for that purpose. The Roman Catholic Church states that God has made her the authorized witness of what he has revealed, and that her testimony, given by the decision of the great majority of her Bishops together with their head, is the infallibly correct rule of ascertaining what has been revealed. In a word, she says that the error of hell will never prevail over her testimony of the truth of heaven. She does not state in this general principle, the special mode by which she will arrive at the knowledge which she communicates: it might, or it might not be the mode which White designates: but one truth is obvious, that if the commission was given at the time designated by the writer, it could not have been then executed in the manner specified by him, because the books containing Christ's doctrine were not then written: and the first commissioners, who had no predecessors in their office, could not know traditions of such predecessors. Neither White, nor his abettors, then, having given to us what the Church states to be her commission, it is proper that we should see what she claims. Her doctrine is, that the testimony given by the judicial decision of the great majority of her Bishops, together with the successor of Peter, who is the head of the Church, is an infallibly correct mode of learning what Christ has taught, as necessary to be believed, and necessary to be practised, in order to obtain salvation. I admit the corollary drawn by White flows from

this; but I assert that what he lays down instead of this proposition, differs very materially therefrom.

I stated that our opponents gave the commission which the Saviour conferred on Peter, as above recited, as our only proof of the infallibility of the Church. I used the expression only, because it is the only proof of ours which they adduce, where the nature of the case fairly required of them to adduce all, or at least several, or to state that there were others. Now, as we produce several others, and they make no allusion even to any one of them; they are ignorant of their existence, or they knew and wilfully concealed them. I shall not interfere with their choice.

Before I proceed to remind you of what our proofs are, allow me to conclude this letter by examining the manner in which even this argument, adduced by themselves, is met by White.

"It will not be denied, that between this unquestionable authority and the statement which precedes it, there is no verbal agreement. A man unacquainted with the system of divinity supported by the Church of Rome, would probably perceive no connection between the alleged passage and the commentary. But let us suppose that these words of our Saviour contain the meaning in question: yet no man will deny, that if they do contain it, it is in an indirect and obscure manner. The fact then is, that even if the Church of Rome should be really endowed with the supernatural assistance which she asserts, the divine founder of Christianity was pleased to make the existence of that extraordinary gift one of the least obvious truths contained in the Gospels."

Now I am one of those who will make that very denial which he says will not be made: for I find a verbal agreement between the subjects of both propositions, "the Church united under Peter and his successors," "My Church built upon Peter," or if the holy alliance will so have it, though such is not the text, "The Church built upon the faith of Peter." I also find a plain agreement between the attributes, "infallible knowledge of what heaven reveals"—and "not to be prevailed against by the gates of hell" or the power of hellish error. I find it also in the circumstance which joins them in each case, viz. the promise of Christ. I am a man, and I deny that the assurance is only either obscurely or indirectly contained in the words, but I assert that it is contained plainly and directly in them, and that it is one of the most obvious truths in the Gospels. Nor am I singular in this. I have the majority of Christendom, during successive ages, at my side: of course our opponents will assert, with their usual modesty and love for republican

principles, that the minority must be right. White continues to disprove our proof in the following manner, page 84:

"It might have been expected, however, that Peter, in his Epistles, or in the addresses to the first Christians, which the Acts record, would have removed the obscurity; and that, since the grant of infallibility to him, to his peculiar Church, and to his successors in the See of that Church, (either independently of the infallibility of others, or in combination with other privileged persons—for this is also left in great obscurity,) was made the only security against the attacks of hell: he would have taken care to explain the secret sense of Christ's address to him. Peter, however, does not make the slightest allusion to his privilege."

In this passage, all that is contained is reducible to this semblance of proof, "Peter does not state that infallibility was granted to the Church; therefore it was not granted." Suppose I were to admit the truth of the first proposition, the second is not a necessary consequence of that admission. St. Matthew, who does state it, is as good a witness as is St. Peter; and the silence of one does not destroy the testimony of the other. The holy alliance and their associates never doubted the fact of Peter's denial of Christ, though he never mentions that fact in his Epistles, and Peter was more disposed to state his faults than his privileges: nor need he in his Epistle testify of that infallibility which no Christian called in question at the time of his writing. But I have farther to object to this passage than dishonesty of construction, to which I have before alluded, a changing of terms; here we have "the grant of infallibility to him:" in page 81, it was the reality of her title to be the "guide and rule of your faith:" here we have "his peculiar Church," that is, the Roman Church: in page 81, it was "your church," "the Roman Catholic Church," which by his confusion of terms he attempted to identify with the "Roman Church," Peter's "peculiar Church." We have here his successors; and a new step is made to take infallibility from the Church and bestow it upon the individual, "independently of the infallibility of others," which is not what he laid down in this statement upon page 63: "the decisions of her head, when approved by the tacit or open consent of the greatest part of her Bishops:" we have here "privileged persons." No mention is made of such persons even in his own statement, for no privilege was given to persons, but authority to give infallibly correct decisions was given to an aggregate body, not to the separate members who compose that body, in their individual or personal capacities; as no power of legislation is given to either the President or to any individual member of Congress taken alone; neither of them has the personal privilege of making a law,

but the legislative authority is vested in their aggregate body. Nor is it true there "is obscurity," nor is it true that there is any "secret sense of Christ's address to Peter." Thus there are a dishonest change of terms, and two false assumptions, together with three or four insinuations of untruth, in this illogical sentence.

"His successors being not named in the supposed original grant of supremacy, it was in course that, by an express declaration, Peter would obviate the natural inference, that they were excluded from his own personal prerogatives. But Peter is equally silent about his successors; and to add to the original mysteriousness of the subject, he never mentions Rome, and dates his Epistles from Babylon. Babylon may figuratively mean Rome; the silence of both our Saviour and his Apostle may, by some strange rule of interpretation, be proved to denote those successors; the whole system, in fine, of the Roman Catholic Church, may be contained in the alleged passage; but, if so, it is contained like a diamond in a mountain."

Mr. White is a member of the Church of England, Bishop Kemp is a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America; let them adopt the principle here in its application to the hierarchy which they say they have, and upon what ground will they prove that the Bishops were to succeed the Apostles? Upon what ground will the gentlemen of other denominations prove that any person was to succeed to a power of administering a sacrament? If they deny that the successor of Peter was to succeed to the power of Peter, they must deny that any minister was to succeed to the power of the first ministers of the Christian religion, because Christ never used the word successors. This has, however, no connexion with the question of infallibility. But the Church was to be built upon Peter, for such is the expression in the original; the subterfuge that the given name of the Apostle does not in the English language signify what it does in the Syro-Chaldaic, will be too miserable to be attempted by any person having respect for his character. White must acknowledge that the proper translation is, "Thou art a *Rock*, and upon this *Rock* I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall never prevail," and so forth. *The rock, Peter* being the foundation, must continue as long as the edifice; for the gentlemen will not assert that we were to have a baseless edifice, and thus the office then instituted in the person was to continue as long as the Church itself, which was to the end of the world. It has now continued during nearly eighteen centuries. The next quibble is indeed a miserable piece of sophistry. We do not state that the Saviour mentioned Rome, nor was it necessary. We say the successors of Peter or the Rock were to be the chief pastors of the

Church; had Peter continued at Antioch, the Bishops of that See would have inherited his power. The facts of his death and the designation of his See, and the recognition of his successor, and not the declaration of the Saviour or his own, pointed out where the power originally given by Christ was to continue. Neither do we say that it is the silence but the institution of the Saviour, and the declaration of his Apostles, which denoted the successors of Peter, nor do we say that the whole system of the Roman Catholic Church—how quickly the gentleman changes his terms—is contained either in that passage or in a mountain.

"The plainest sense of any one passage of the Scriptures cannot be so palpable as the obscurity of the present. It follows, therefore, with all the force of demonstration, that the divine right claimed by the Pope and his Church to be the infallible rule of faith, having no other than an obscure and doubtful foundation, the belief in it cannot be obligatory on all Christians, who are left to follow the suggestions of their individual judgment as to the obscure meaning of the Scriptures, till the Scriptures themselves shall be found to demand the resignation of that judgment."

Now I believe the gentleman will be found here begging all his positions, for the passage is not obscure; the only demonstration which he has made is that of his own dishonesty; and he concludes by assuming that which we deny, that if the Scriptures be obscure, there is no way of knowing their meaning until they shall be made clear by themselves. This is another question, which I must lay aside for the present.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXXIII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Apr. 23, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I have shown you in my last letter, White's falsehoods, and dishonesty respecting our doctrine of infallibility. We shall see in his next passage what is in perfect accordance with his last assumption, viz. "That individuals are by the Christian law left to follow the suggestions of their individual judgment as to the obscure meaning of the Scriptures, till the Scriptures themselves shall be found to demand the resignation of that judgment." In other words this is an assertion that Christ gave us only the Scriptures to lead us to a knowledge of his doctrine. The assertion contains two mistakes, because the Saviour did not give us the Scriptures; and the mode of learning the doctrine which was established by him, and followed by his Apostles, was not

by submitting the meaning of the Scriptures to the judgment of individuals. And indeed St. Peter tells us that many persons who proceeded upon this plan did thereby procure their own damnation.

White's object, as is that of all those who are engaged in the same cause with him, is to persuade mankind, first, that every individual is equally authorized to pass his private judgment upon the meaning of every text, and next to bring them to a belief that from a vast number of the passages which are so obscure, no person can with certainty know the doctrine which God taught, and hence they must inevitably arrive at these conclusions: That God revealed to man doctrines for his belief, which doctrines he cannot discover: or else that he gave a revelation which being unintelligible, man is at liberty to reject: or else that man is bound to believe doctrines which are not only undiscoverable, but also unintelligible. This I submit, is not very complimentary to God, to man, to the Bible, or to Christianity; and has been the chief cause of that extensive infidelity which we now witness. Mark what he has written, and what the holy alliance has approved and recommended to the perusal of their flocks, page 85:

"I request you to observe, that the force of my argument does not depend upon the erroneousness of the Roman interpretation of the passages alleged for the spiritual supremacy; all I contend for is the doubtfulness of their meaning: for to suppose that the divine founder of Christianity, while providing against doubt in his future followers, would miss his aim by overlooking the obscurity in which he left the remedy he wished to appoint; is a notion from which Christians must shrink. It follows, therefore, either that Christ did not intend what the Romanists believe about Peter and his Church; or that, since he concealed his meaning, an obedience to the Roman Church cannot be a necessary condition in his disciples."

How would the venerable gentlemen answer the Baptist from whom the majority of them differ, when he tells them, "At least my friends, you have only your surmises that infants are capable of baptism. You must admit that it is doubtful if they are, you must then admit that Christ did not intend infant baptism to be a necessary doctrine for his disciples." What will the venerable body say to the Unitarian, who defies them to produce a single text from the Scriptures which would even create a doubt in favor of what he is pleased to call the monstrous and absurd doctrine of a Triune God? Especially as several of them have very generously, and with becoming liberality made him a present of the 7th verse of the fifth chapter of *St. John's First Epistle*. Upon their principle there must be more or less of doubt as to every doctrine: upon

ours there is no doubt respecting any doctrine. When therefore the gentleman and his abettors assume what we deny, and draw inferences from the assumption, it is not reasoning, it is unbecoming sophistry; and all that is built upon such a foundation must totter and fall. They assume that what we assert to be clear, plain, and distinct, is obscure and doubtful. They next tell us that what is doubtful proves nothing; we admit the principle, but we deny its applicability to the case before us.

The value of the succeeding paragraph is easily settled, after the view which I have thus taken, page 86:

"The liberty which, upon the supposition most favorable to Rome, Christ has granted to believers in his Gospel, the Pope and his Church most positively deny them. Placing themselves between mankind and the Redeemer, they allow those only to approach him, who first make a full surrender of their judgment to the Popes and councils. A belief in Christ and his work of redemption, grounded on the Scriptures and their evidences, is thus made useless, unless it is preceded by a belief in Roman supremacy, grounded on mere surmises. Christianity is removed from its broad foundation, to place the mighty fabric upon the moveable sand of conjectural meaning."

The first passage begs the question: the second is an untruth, for we say "the Pope and his Church" only remain where the Redeemer placed them, we place them nowhere: and there is no surrender of judgment in receiving the judicial testimony of an authorized witness. The third passage is a pitiable misrepresentation, containing the insinuation of an impossibility, the statement of an untruth, and a shifting of the case; because there could be no scripture evidence without the testimony of the Church; and the evidence of the right and power of the Church to give that testimony, rests upon plain facts, and not upon mere surmises; and the question is not concerning Roman Supremacy, but concerning the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church. The concluding passage, as being the result of the others, contains the combination of their faults.

The following passage upon which it is now necessary for me to remark, winds up his observations, page 87:

"This looks more like love of self than of Christ; more like ambition than charity. The title to infallibility and supremacy being at the best doubtful, the benefit of the doubt should have been left to Christian liberty. But may not the opposite conduct of the Roman Church have arisen from sincere zeal for what she conceived to be the true intention of Christ? Christian candor would demand this construction, were it not for the use she has made of the assumed privilege: yet if we find that, having erected herself into an organ of heaven, all her oracular

decisions have invariably tended towards the increase of her own power; it will be difficult to admit the purity of her intentions."

Before I commence the examination of his succeeding topics, I now feel authorized plainly to charge White and his American sponsors with having grossly imposed upon his readers. They concur with him in asserting that the claim of the Roman Catholic Church to infallibility in her doctrinal decisions rests only on the text adduced in page 83. I have before given my reasons for the introduction of the word only. Now this text is by no means the only ground upon which we rely: there are very many prior and very many subsequent facts besides that of the promise made by the Redeemer on this occasion; and there are several other considerations, a few of which I shall rather allude to, than enlarge upon.

The first ground which I rest upon, is the very nature of faith. Faith is a divine virtue by which we believe what God teaches: this belief is founded upon the impossibility of a mistake on the part of the Omniscient Being who makes the revelation; and the impossibility of deceit, on his part, as being essential truth. God cannot be himself deceived, nor can he deceive us; therefore the mind rests with the utmost certainty of truth upon his declarations: the heavens and the earth may pass away, but his word will not fail. The truth of God being the foundation of faith, the soul cannot admit the shadow of a doubt as to the truth of his declaration; faith is lost at the very instant that any deliberate doubt is wilfully entertained in the soul. Thus it is not a profession of faith to declare that I think it highly probable that there are three persons in one God: that such is my opinion, but that I may be in error: that possibly there is but one person, and that I am under a delusion. This would not be a declaration of my firm belief of what God had taught, but a declaration of what was my own individual opinion. Thus the very nature of faith requiring that it should be a firm and unshaken belief of what cannot possibly be an error; not only must the God who reveals, but also the witness who gives me the testimony or the revelation, be infallibly identified with truth, so far as that testimony is concerned; otherwise I might be deceived, I could not have certainty, and therefore [would] not have Faith. Upon this view of the nature of Faith, it can exist only in those souls to which God has given special and individual revelation of his doctrine; or else, if he made a general revelation for mankind, and appointed teachers of that revelation, he must have made their testimony an infallible evidence of his doctrine to those whom he sent them to instruct: and the moment it ceased to be such evidence, the foundation of Faith was altogether removed.

Suffer me to put a plain case to which this principle will apply. It is now nearly eighteen centuries since Christ was on earth and gave his revelation. He required; as I am led to believe that it was essential to that Faith which is necessary for salvation [that he should do]; that all who heard him should believe truly and firmly in the nature of God, and of the Redeemer. Had I [had] the happiness to live at that period when he was on earth, and heard from his lips what that nature was, I would firmly believe his declaration. I have not had that consolation, but a Bible which I am told, is believed to contain his doctrine upon this head, is put into my hands: I read, and an Episcopalian tells me, that it clearly teaches that there is a Triune God, and that the Redeemer is a God-man. An Unitarian on my other side asks me where that is found in the book, and tells me that my Episcopalian friend mistakes the meaning of those passages. I ask the Episcopalian upon what grounds he will show that this explanation is not incorrect, and besides the texts which he adduces, he tells me that he can show that in the several ages of the Church they were explained as he now explains them: the Unitarian asks him whether those men were infallibly correct in their explanations; and whether in fact it be not true that "the Church of Hierusalem, of Antioch, and Alexandria, as also that of Rome, have erred not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith," (art. xixth, of Protestant Episcopal Church). And further: whether it be not true "that Laity and Clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women and children of whole Christendom, (an horrible and most dreadful thing to think) have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man, and that by the space of eight hundred years and more."—(*Homilies*, p. 201.) The Episcopalian acknowledges that it is a fact that those Churches did err in matters of faith, and that all Christendom, Clergy and Laity was during upwards of eight hundred years drowned in abominable idolatry. The Unitarian still presses him to know whether he or his Church is less liable to error than all Christendom, and if he is equally liable to err, what assurance has he that he is not now in error, when he asserts that there is a Triune God; and how is he certain that he is not guilty of damnable idolatry in adoring as God, Jesus who died upon the cross? I ask whether either of them claims to be infallibly correct, and perfectly competent to inform me of any one doctrine without the possibility of being mistaken. They tell me, "No, we do not claim infallibility." But they tell me to read and to decide for myself. Really I can only form a good conjecture, but I look at the Episco-

palian's text, I *John*, v, 7, "For there are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." The Unitarian assures me that this text is not a part of the divine revelation, but is an interpolation. This the Episcopalian denies, —and is asked by his opponent, whether he is infallibly certain that it was a part of the original text. Thus at my very outset, I am left at a perfect loss not only to know the meaning of phrases, but whether the very phrases are genuine. And in this situation, I feel [that] one of two results must be the consequence: either God has established for my guidance some witness which will infallibly lead me to a knowledge of what I could not discover with certainty, and thus I must have an infallible witness of doctrine; or faith is not attainable, and is not necessary for salvation. We find the first to be true in fact as well as in theory. Our Protestant friends, whilst they teach the necessity of Faith, have by denying the infallibility of the Church, created in their societies the impression that Faith is not necessary, nor indeed attainable. It is not my business to reconcile contradictions; but the very nature of Faith implies the necessity of an infallible witness of revelation.

We also find another ground in the very object of revelation. That object is to give man from heaven, easily and perfectly, knowledge to which he could never or only with great difficulty attain by natural means, and perhaps then only imperfectly. Thus the communication of divine knowledge upon which man might build his hopes and regulate his conduct, was a principal object of the divine communications. Without revelation, man was left to conjecture, to probability, to the wandering of his private judgment. But with the testimony of God for his guidance, knowledge succeeds to conjecture, certainty to probability, and public and unchanging evidence to private and erring judgment. The truth which is given to all, becomes the great rule for the guidance of all; and the perplexity of disquisition being removed, the minds of the sage and of the simple are equally taught by their common Creator and Father, the common truths respecting his nature and theirs, and their duties which are the results. The object being then to give to man the certain knowledge of heavenly doctrine; that could be attained only by some mode which would give that knowledge with infallible certainty: and this could be effected by no less means than by giving to us the utmost certainty of the infallible competency of the witness. Thus if I might be misled or deceived by the witness who testifies to me what is the doctrine, one of the great objects of revelation is defeated.

Suppose I am certain that Christ taught the doctrine of Heaven in Jerusalem on the day of his ascension; of what avail will that be to

me unless I know what that doctrine was?—Suppose I am convinced that the book which is in my hands contains the expressions which he used; of what avail is that to me, unless I know what he meant by those expressions? If I have the expressions without any certainty of what ideas he intended to convey by them, of what use is his revelation to me? I am not thereby instructed. When it is my misfortune to live at a time when several divisions of his followers are contradicting each other as to the meaning of every phrase, and the nature of every doctrine, if I have no infallible guide to lead me from the labyrinth, how shall I be extricated? Of what use to me is an unintelligible book? The great object of his revelation, viz. a certain knowledge of what he taught, is to me unattainable, without an infallible guide, one that cannot lead me into error; and because they have been persuaded that there is no such guide to be found, millions have abandoned in utter despair and disgust, all inquiry for the doctrines of Christ.

Another great object of revelation was to restrain, and to humble the pride of man's understanding, as it was by the indulgence of this guide he fell, and as its exaltation is a principal obstacle to his spiritual perfection: so far from being attained, this object is counteracted by the principle of submitting each doctrine to the private judgment of individuals.

These general principles lead to the conclusion that for the knowledge of revealed truth, for the existence of faith, and healing the ravages which the pride of intellect has made in the human soul, it is absolutely necessary that the witness of doctrine should be infallible.

Allow me to expatiate a little upon the application. Let me now be desirous of learning what God has revealed at any time to any portion of the human race; clearly I can obtain that knowledge only in one of two ways, either by the testimony of God himself, or by some other testimony. Few if any will assert that God himself is to be to me individually the witness of what he has formerly, for instance, manifested to Moses, to Abraham, or to St. Paul. To indulge this supposition would be, indeed, to assert that the communications of heaven to one individual, were absolutely useless to every other. Yet there have been sects in the reformed Churches that held the principle; for they taught, that the only evidence which we can have of revealed truth is from the Spirit of God making manifest to our spirit that this is the doctrine: and until we are prepared to come to this point fully and entirely, it is not possible to adopt the maxim that the private judgment of each individual is to be the rule of his doctrine of faith. I shall now add but little on this subject.

One of the best arguments used against our claim to Church infallibility is the alleged contradiction of our decisions upon doctrine; for, say our opponents, God cannot teach contradictions. We admit the correctness of the principle: and when they shew us in fact such contradictory decisions of doctrine, even upon one single point, I shall cease to be a Roman Catholic; I will publish my name, retract what I have written, and depart from your communion. Admitting then the force of the principle, I find in all the individuals as well as Churches that claim this evidence of the Spirit, palpable doctrinal contradiction; and I therefore conclude, that what has thus perpetually misled, cannot be the evidence of the God of truth.

I must then find some other testimony; and clearly it must be that, either of a document, or of an individual, or of a body: by one of these I must be taught what I desire to know. Suppose a document is handed to me; it will not be evidence until I receive sufficient testimony of its nature, and value. I cannot receive this from the Spirit speaking to my spirit, as I saw before. My witness must be either an individual or a body; and unless that witness can give me infallible certainty, I cannot have perfect assurance of what God has taught; and without this perfect assurance, I cannot have unshaken belief, which alone is faith. Hence, if Faith is firm and unhesitating belief of what God has taught, it must be founded upon infallible certainty, and this certainty must rest upon infallible evidence, which evidence I can receive only from an infallible witness; this infallible witness cannot be one which has been detected in frequent and flagrant contradictions, it cannot be the private spirit or judgment of individuals. Where then am I to find this witness? I shall in my next give the outline of our doctrine upon this head. Not to enter into the reasoning by which it is upheld; but to prove the truth of the assertion which I made that White and his associates did not state our case fairly.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXXIV

CHARLESTON, S. C., Apr. 30, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—In my last letter, I exhibited to you an outline of the reasons which show that, without an infallible guide to the knowledge of doctrine, it is impossible to have faith; and that the great objects of revelation would be unattainable. I proceed now to show you that, whenever revelation was given, such a guide was pointed out. The books

of Moses contain no revelation of man's immortality, nor of his accountability in another world, for the actions done in his mortal state. Yet it is manifest, that the people of Israel did believe in the immortality of the soul, and in a future judgment, which was to be followed by a state of eternal reward and of eternal punishment, and that they believed it as a revelation made by God, and not as a mere discovery of human reasoning; also that they believed it before the books themselves were written by Moses. How was this revelation given? How was it preserved? What was the evidence of its infallible truth and certainty? God himself gave the evidence of his presence, and made his declarations to the patriarchs, and continued those manifestations to them in the midst of their families, who were frequently witnesses of such revelations, and thus during the period which preceded the days of Moses, there existed in the unanimous testimony of the heads of the families of Israel, unquestionable evidence that God had spoken to their fathers, and revealed to them the few doctrines, the belief of which he required, and gave to them the short but cheering and simple promises upon which their hopes rested, and instituted the few but significant ceremonies of their external worship. The faithful Israelite received the testimony given by his fathers, admitted and preserved by his kindred, and in that testimony saw the infallible evidence of what God had taught, promised, and instituted; this he believed, looked for, and adhered to. The public testimony of the whole body, and not the internal inspiration of his own mind, or the discovery of his private judgment, was his rule of faith and practice, before the days of Moses, whether he wandered in Canaan or served in Egypt.

Thus, from the fall of Adam to the death of Joseph, the faithful adorers of the true God were never bereft of a living witness, to whom God had spoken, and who, in the midst of his people, testified to them the communications of the Most High; his commission to announce to them the will of God was placed in sufficient evidence, and his doctrines agreed exactly with those of his predecessors; and hence there was full and infallible testimony upon which faith was to be built. Their eye always beheld the cloud of witnesses by day; and in the night, the splendor of heavenly guidance led them in the path to their salvation.

From the death of Joseph to the birth of Moses, there elapsed about sixty years; and though we possess little documentary testimony to show that, during this period, there had been any special revelation given to continue for a century the special interference of heaven, in a miraculous manner, for the preservation of the doctrine; still, from the history of the former, and of the subsequent periods, it will not be

a very outrageous supposition that God did occasionally and specially make a renewed disclosure and promise. Josephus, the Jewish historian, in chapter ix, book ii, tells us that Amran, the father of Moses, had a special revelation previous to his son's birth. If, then, this mode which had commenced in the days of Adam, continued to the arrival of Moses, when he claimed from Pharao the liberation of his brethren, there was no moment in which the people of God had not to that period in their sight a miraculously authorized witness, who, together with those that heard his predecessors, testified with infallible certainty the nature of the doctrines which God had taught, and of the religious institutions which he had established. If a century elapsed without such a miraculously taught commissioner, there existed the concordant testimony of the heads of the house of Israel, teaching what had been given to them as delivered by the God of their fathers. Thus to the period of the public ministry of Moses, faith was founded upon the infallible testimony of a public witness, not upon the opinions and surmises, and conjectures of the private judgment of individuals; and thus the facts in the history of the religion to the days of Moses, are in perfect accordance with the principles which I have exhibited in my last letter.

It will not be disputed that during his life time, Moses was, after leading out the people of Israel, an infallibly correct witness of the doctrines of heaven; and that through him the revelation was given to the multitude, after his commission had been fully exhibited. Nor will it, I suppose, be questioned, that the preservation of the law then given, and its explanation was committed not indiscriminately to the individuals of the multitude, but to a special tribunal then established for this amongst other purposes, by God himself. Nor will it be denied, that this tribunal was to continue as long as the law itself should be in force, and that the special and particular manner in which its members were to be selected and appointed was established by God himself. It will also be conceded, that no human power could abrogate what the divine power established, and that the wisdom of God foresaw the future contingencies for which it would be necessary to provide.

The Aaronitic priesthood was established by God, to last in authority until the arrival of the Messias, at which period the Mosaic law was to terminate. It was established and confirmed by God, that the high priest, together with his council, was to have a final appellate jurisdiction in all cases, as well of religion as of rites, and other matters of the Levitical law. Thus, from the establishment of the Aaronitic priesthood, the high priest, with the Sanhedrim, was the witness of

doctrine; and as such was established by God himself, [who] allowed no appeal from their decision.

Let us now suppose a case, and try it by the contradictory principles of our opponents and our own. Suppose an individual in the Jewish nation finding no mention in the books of Moses of a future life, and its state of rewards and punishments, were to assert that this book written by the direction of God himself was to be the sole rule of his faith, and that his own private judgment was to direct him to its true meaning: that he is not bound to believe any doctrine which he does not read as clearly written in that book, or evidently deducible therefrom; that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul and of a future state of reward and punishment is not clearly written, or evidently deducible from the books of Moses, and therefore he is not bound to believe such doctrine as an article of faith: that he may fairly teach what he is convinced is true; and therefore he teaches this doctrine in Israel, that man's existence terminates at death. Suppose this man to be a ruler of a synagogue. The high priest and the Sanhedrim testify that, although not contained in the Pentateuch, nor perhaps deducible from any passage therein, the doctrine of immortality and future rewards and punishments had been revealed to their fathers repeatedly before the days of Moses, and believed before and since the revelation of Sinai; that they have abundant evidence of the fact of the revelation of this doctrine, though not in that precise book, and that in their capacity as the public tribunal to testify doctrine and to expound the law, they declare that the immortality of the soul is a doctrine of faith. This man will not receive their decision, and will say, if they are not a tribunal which can testify with infallible certainty of truth, they might err; if they might err, he may perhaps be right, and in adopting their decision, he might not be led to truth, but to falsehood. Yet God constituted this a supreme tribunal, to whose decisions he commanded obedience under the penalty of death; are we then to say that God commanded that a man should be put to death for not perhaps abandoning the truth? because such is the inconsistency, if the tribunal be not infallible. All this difficulty and absurdity, however, vanish upon the simple supposition, that the Deity constituted that tribunal the infallible witness of his doctrine; and such was the light in which this great council was viewed by the Jewish people, and therefore it was not only made the witness of the ancient revelations, which it had received by traditionary evidence, but also of the written revelation given by Moses, and the judicial tribunal to explain the meaning of both in all cases of doubt; and they who broke

away from its communion, were not considered to be in the true faith of the law of Moses.

Let us for a moment dwell upon this case. Would God have established this tribunal to teach, and commanded that its decisions should be received under penalty of death, if he foresaw that it would or could lead into error, in place of guiding to truth? Is not his command to obey its decisions, considered in connexion with his essential connexion with truth, a guarantee to those, to whom the precept is given, that the decision will be infallibly true? If, in obeying the precept by receiving the decision, we were led into error, would not God be the author of that error? Will common sense or religion permit us to disobey the precept of our Creator requiring our submission, or permit us to charge him with having forced us to embrace error in obeying his law! It cannot be error. It must infallibly be truth.

Forgetting for a moment the fact, that God commanded this submission to the decisions of the Jewish council, and supposing no such precept to exist, and no such power to be vested in this body, how was this ruler of the synagogue, who taught that man did not survive the grave, to be corrected? Or, if he was right, how was that ruler who contradicted him, and taught the erroneous doctrine of the immortality of the soul to be corrected? Or how was an inquirer after truth to know which doctrine God had revealed, for he could not have revealed them both? If the Church of Israel had not in her high priest and council an infallible witness of God's revelation, how was that revelation to be known? These are difficulties which to me are perfectly insoluble. They may, perhaps, be easily and satisfactorily explained by Blanco White, or the Rev. William Hawley. I feel convinced, that without an infallible witness of doctrine, there is no rational ground for faith; and I see, in fact, that from the day God spoke to Adam, down to the arrival of the Messias, such a witness was found, in the line of Patriarchs to Moses, and in the Sanhedrim to Jesus Christ. By this testimony, the doctrines of revelation, written and unwritten, have been preserved and presented to the world. This was the doctrine of the Jewish Church, at the period of Christ's arrival, and so far from marking it down as erroneous, he confirmed and approved it. He called the Sanhedrim hypocrites; but he declared that they sat upon the chair of Moses: he reproved their works, and admonished the people not to imitate their conduct; but he charged the same people to hold their doctrines of faith and to obey their decisions. And if we believe that the Holy Ghost inspired the Evangelist St. John to write his Gospel, we have the distinct testimony of that divine Spirit (*John* xi, 49, 50, 51), that

Caiphas did in virtue of his office, give a correct doctrinal decision, though, with a bad intention, as if to show to the world that the criminality of an unworthy head would not create an untrue testimony, in a tribunal which was even upon the point of losing its commission, and when the very being, whose appearance was to be cotemporary with its decline, was gathering the members of the body which was to be substituted under a new jurisdiction in its stead.

But the good gentlemen, who charge us with having no grounds for our doctrine of infallibility, either never knew, or affect to forget, that the Christian religion is not a system which was put together by human discovery, but one which was framed by the Saviour, and then delivered to his disciples to be preserved. In place, therefore, of seeking for texts upon which disputes might be raised (for ingenuity can raise them at will upon the plainest expressions) we should look to the facts whose existence is uncontroverted, and from which the truth can be with facility deduced. It is plain that Jesus Christ was an infallibly correct witness of the true doctrine, and that his infallible correctness was the only basis of the faith of his disciples, and this infallibility being removed, their faith could have no basis. If he required faith from the persons who never saw or heard him, he must have given them an equally good basis for their belief. Hence, when he sent his Apostles to teach his doctrine to those who had neither seen nor heard himself, he empowered them to work miracles, that they might thereby give evidence that they taught truth with infallible certainty; thus their disciples had the evidence of infallible guides. Upon what principle could other nations or succeeding generations be required to give similar assent of faith without equally firm ground? The principle of the necessity of such a guide is recognized by us, and we exhibit now the fact of its existence. Amongst the doctrines taught to those disciples by preaching, before a single line of the Gospel was written, was that the doctrines of Jesus were to be taught by virtue of a commission of the Saviour given to the Apostles, to be communicated to others, and perpetuated to the end of the world, in order that men might at all times be taught those doctrines by proper authority; and that the Saviour declared, that whosoever heard them, heard him, and whosoever despised them despised him; and that he promised to them the Spirit of truth, who would bring to their minds all things whatsoever he had taught them, and would perfect the revelation, so that they should be witnesses to him; and that as he sent them to teach all nations, to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded, so he declared he would be with them all days to the end of the world; and that the Spirit of truth should abide with them always;

and that the gates of hell should never prevail against that Church which he built upon Simon, the son of Jonas, whose name he changed to Rock or Peter, and to whom he gave a memorable assurance, that he had prayed for him that his faith should not fail; and to whom he gave in charge, when he should be converted after his fall, for Satan desired to sift him as wheat, that he should confirm his brethren; and that he also gave to him, having previously required a declaration of greater love, a charge to feed his lambs, and to feed his sheep, as he had promised to give to him the keys, or power of vicegerent, as was designated in eastern courts, by bearing the keys in the palace; what he should bind on earth should be bound in heaven, and what he would loose on earth would be loosed in heaven. That the Apostles testified this, was evident to the first Christians; and, therefore, the fact of the authority to teach being in them and in their successors, the pastors of that Church built upon Peter, was evident to those Christians; and, indeed they had no other mode of knowing the doctrines of revelation, but by such teaching. Surely, then, there was no hunting for the evidence of this in texts which as yet had not been written. They saw the Holy Ghost descend upon those Apostles; they witnessed their miracles; they recognized them as infallible witnesses of the truth; they saw them associate others to their commission; giving them a part in their ministry; making them co-witnesses; and when a discussion arose as to what the doctrine of Jesus was upon certain points, they assembled those associates together with themselves, and instead of telling the disputants to read and judge for themselves, they made a judicial decision under the guidance of that Holy Ghost that was given to remain always, for the purpose of leading them into all truth; and having testified what the doctrine was, they commanded their decision to be followed. The Apostles thus exhibited the tribunal of the pastors of the Church by the institution of Christ, and under the influence of the Holy Ghost, [as] an infallible guide to lead mankind to a knowledge of the doctrines of Christ, to the very end of the world. As yet, the New Testament did not exist; portions of it were occasionally written, but it never was compiled as a summary of the Christian doctrine; and, although all its contents are true, yet it was not compiled to be the repertory of all the revealed truths of the new law, nor was it to supersede that mode of teaching established by Christ, and made evident by the Apostles; and certainly the Church was not to have less power, because a portion of its doctrine and history was committed to writing.

Nay, more, there were several spurious books published, purporting to be the revealed doctrine of Christ; and it was only by the

authority of the Church that the early Christians were enabled to draw the line of separation between that which was written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and that which was not. If that Church was not an infallibly correct guide, she might have rejected what was genuine, and given the faithful as the doctrine of God, the invention of man. Thus, if the Church was not infallible, we have no infallible certainty at the present day that the New Testament is the Scripture of God.

Reason, the example of the Old Law, and the testimony of the Apostles, and of the intermediate ages, prove to us the infallibility of the Church, as they proved it to the first Christians, before the New Testament was written; and that book itself could not be to us the evidence of revelation, if the witness from which we receive it was fallible. Thus there always was, and ever will be an infallible witness of doctrine on earth. Mr. White and his coadjutors were then guilty of gross misrepresentation, arising either from ignorance, or some less creditable cause, when they stated that our whole proof lay in a passage which White endeavors to render obscure, that he may destroy the evidence which it contains, if he can bewilder his readers. I have not here argued to maintain the doctrine, but [have] exhibited how grossly the flocks of the holy alliance are deceived, if they believe White and their pastors, as to what our arguments are.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXXV

CHARLESTON, S. C., May 7, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—Having seen that White stated unfairly and imperfectly the case of our claim to Church infallibility, and that he with still more effrontery asserted that he gave our arguments in its support; I now come to examine the sequel of his remarks upon this topic. He says in pages 86 and 87:

"The liberty which, upon the supposition most favorable to Rome, Christ has granted to believers in his Gospel, the Pope and his Church most positively deny them. Placing themselves between mankind and the Redeemer, they allow those only to approach him, who first make a full surrender of their judgment to Popes and Councils. A belief in Christ and his work of redemption, grounded on the Scriptures and their evidences, is thus made useless, unless it is preceded by a belief in Roman supremacy, grounded on mere surmises. Christianity is removed from

its broad foundation, to place the mighty fabric upon the moveable sand of a conjectural meaning."

Here is one of the most extravagant and contradictory assertions which I have ever met with, viz. that Christ granted to believers in the Gospel the liberty of believing or rejecting what he taught. The Pope and the Church do indeed deny that he granted any such liberty, and they therefore most positively deny the truth of White's assertion that he did grant such liberty; but they do not deny to any man the exercise of that liberty which Christ bestowed: the question is concerning the fact of its bestowal. This man every where assumes as true that which is untrue, and whose truth is denied; and then has the effrontery to state that he has made the supposition most favorable to what he is endeavoring to overthrow by his falsehood. The Roman Catholic doctrine is, "Christ did not leave man at liberty to reject the doctrine of infallibility." White's assertion is, "The supposition that you are at liberty to adopt the doctrine of infallibility is the most favorable to Rome." No, my friends, that supposition which is most favorable, is that which is true, and that is, "Christ did not leave men at liberty to reject or to adopt his doctrines at their caprice, he bound them to believe what he teaches by the testimony of his Infallible Church." That Church existed before the Gospel; men know nothing of the Gospel except through her testimony; destroy her infallibility and the evidence of the Gospel is lost. Thus St. Augustine said fourteen centuries ago, "I would not believe the Gospel except for the testimony of the Church."

I cannot quarrel with White's English, as he is a foreigner; but I do not well understand whom he means by themselves in the second clause, "placing themselves between mankind and the Redeemer." If he means the Apostles and their successors in authority, Christ placed them between himself and mankind, when he constituted them his witnesses to mankind, when he gave them as teachers to mankind, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." "You shall be to me witnesses . . . . to the ends of the earth." St. Paul and the Apostles themselves took this station as being appointed thereto by heaven. The people who believed, considered them as the ministers of God, ambassadors between the Redeemer and mankind. What does Bishop Kemp say of himself? Does he not place himself between mankind and the Redeemer? The Catholic Church never placed him there; nor did it so place any other member of the holy assailants. Yet they place themselves there. Indeed they do not ask submission to the Church, that is the Popes and Councils which succeed to Peter and his brethren; but they ask a full surrender to some body or individual which began

by denying to the whole Catholic world what it arrogates to itself, a knowledge of the revelation of God. They destroy the power of the Pope, that each teacher might exercise a greater dominion over the minds of his hearers than the Pope and Council can exercise in the Church.

A belief in Christ and his redemption, grounded on the Scriptures, without grounding those Scriptures upon any testimony, is indeed what White in page 22 describes. "Was then Christianity nothing but a groundless fabric, the world supported by the elephant, the elephant standing upon the tortoise?" The belief in Christ rests on the Scriptures: upon what do the Scriptures rest? Upon fallible testimony, and then they are no security, or upon infallible testimony, and then they are security; but it is the Church which testifies to them, and therefore she is infallible. It is ridiculous to talk of rational belief, founded upon a document for whose sufficiency I have not proper evidence. The value of the Scripture is only as great as that of the testimony by which it is established; and that witness is the Church. There is but one mode of evading the force of this reasoning, and that mode Bishop Kemp's associates of other Churches take, by making the witness of Scripture the private inspiration of each individual, or the Holy Ghost speaking within him; thus they make the individual members infallible, and deny infallibility to their aggregate: what each possesses alone, is lost to the whole when they assemble, because though the Holy Ghost will guide each separately to the infallible knowledge of the word of God and its meaning; yet when from their combination the Church is formed, the Holy Spirit will not lead that Church infallibly to the same knowledge. This is indeed an extraordinary mode of evading the conclusion; separately and singly, even though you contradict each other, you are guided by the Spirit of Truth; but if you join together and agree, you are fallible and liable to error!!! For the alternative must never be taken, viz, The Church is not liable to error. Bishop Kemp very modestly renounces individual infallibility and Church infallibility, and thus the individuals and the Church are liable to err in pointing out the word of God, and in discovering its meaning; and therefore a belief in Christ and his work of redemption grounded upon the Scriptures, and their evidences, is thus made not indeed useless but impossible; for there is no evidence, and to ground the belief upon want of evidence, would be indeed an absurdity. We may find ground for this evidence upon infallibility, and this we ground not upon Roman Supremacy, or mere surmises, but upon irrefragable and convincing proofs—and we thus place the mighty fabric of Christianity, not upon the moveable sand of fallible opinion, or the notion of private

individual inspiration, but upon the broad ground of that foundation upon which Christ placed it, when he fixed as its basis a rock which the world must always behold, and against which hell can never prevail.

White proceeds, page 87:

"This looks more like love of self than of Christ; more like ambition than charity. The title of infallibility and supremacy being at the best doubtful, the benefit of the doubt should have been left to Christian liberty. But may not the opposite conduct of the Roman Church have arisen from sincere zeal for what she conceived to be the true intention of Christ? Christian candor would demand this construction, were it not for the use she has made of the assumed privilege: yet if we find that, having erected herself into an organ of heaven, all her oracular decisions have invariably tended towards the increase of her own power; it will be difficult to admit the purity of her intentions."

This mode of examining a question concerning a fact of revealed religion is perfectly ridiculous: since the true question is not what "it looks like," but whether "it is a divine institution." Moreover the assertion is not true, for the love of Christ is the preservation of his doctrine, "he that loves me will keep my word," and there can be no mode of preserving his doctrine, save by proper testimony, there can be for this no proper testimony, save that which will lead us without danger of error to its knowledge. Christ himself points out that infallible witness in that Church which he built upon Peter, and the adherence to his institution is the best evidence of his love.

Charity leads us to seek what is for the welfare of our neighbor; the preservation of that truth which will bring him to eternal life, is the best mode of seeking his welfare. Ambition is an inordinate desire of power to which we have no claim: the testifying what we have received from others for the purpose of being transmitted by our testimony to our successors, the assurance that we faithfully discharge this great duty, the humble belief that Christ will fulfil his promise of not permitting error to triumph over that testimony, and thereby destroy that evidence, is not ambition. Much more does it savor of ambition in an individual to dogmatize against this testimony, and to declare in opposition to ages and nations united, that his private judgment is better able to know what Christ taught almost eighteen centuries before White was born.

It is not true that the title to infallibility, and supremacy is doubtful: and there being no doubt, the benefit of the doubt could not be given to Christian liberty. But what is meant by Christian liberty in this place? Liberty to believe or to disbelieve according to your caprice. Call you this faith? Liberty to be carried to and fro by every gust of

opinion. Call you this a blessing? Liberty of contradiction, so that I might to-day say that Christ taught the doctrine of the real presence, and to-morrow assert that he did not. Call you this knowledge? Thus it is, that sounds delude. Christian liberty properly understood means that man is free where God has not bound him: but where God declares what is his will, man is no longer free, he is at that moment bound to believe; knowledge is a blessing, faith is a privilege, it is the communication of heavenly wisdom, man should receive it as his best boon, as the dearest pledge of his teacher's affection. How inestimable a benefit is it to be taught by God! How great the misfortune to be certain that he spoke for our information, but to be uncertain of what he said! Yet this is the Christian liberty for which the holy alliance would contend! White again unfairly changes his ground when instead of examining the evidence of the fact, he speculates upon the motive of the Church in assuming that she is infallible, and that her head is supreme:—and because she does not decide that she has not the power which she received from God, he would have us conclude that she has it not, and that she knows herself to be without it. Thus according to this new system of logic, if a judge declares that he holds the commission of his office the declaration is evidence of his ambition, his ambition is evidence of his unfitness, and his unfitness is proof that he has no valid commission; if he states that he has no commission, then his word is good, and because he has no commission he is to be believed. This would be a convenient argument for every culprit to use against every judge. Suppose one of his Presbyterian compeers told Bishop Kemp, that his claim of holding a higher order than that of a Presbyter, looked more like ambition than charity: what would be his answer? Suppose he was told that his title was at best doubtful, and the benefit of the doubt ought to be left to Christian liberty: how would he reason with his old and new associate?—Suppose the honest Quaker was to tell the whole collection of our reverend assailants that the very use which they make of their assumed privilege is proof of their fraud, and does not argue in favor of their zeal for what they conceive to be the true intention of Christ; for they erect themselves into an organ of heaven; and all their oracular decisions invariably tend towards the increase of their own power: what would the good gentlemen retort? Is not this charge daily made upon them? Are they not told that they do these things for the sake of filthy lucre? And do they not assert that the persons who thus charge them are imps of hell, foes of the Gospel, enemies of Christ, liars and blasphemers?

I shall not give such names to those who bestow them, but I should like to know their answer.

White now abandons every semblance of argument, and merely has recourse to prejudice for his protection, page 87.

"By comparing the articles of the Church of Rome with those of the Church of England, we shall find that the points of difference are chiefly these: tradition, transubstantiation, the number of sacraments, purgatory, indulgences, and the invocation of saints. Such are the main questions on doctrine, at issue between the two Churches; for the differences about free-will and justification might, I believe, be settled without much difficulty, by accurately defining the language on both sides. Now I will not assume the truth of the Protestant tenets on these points, nor enter into arguments against those of the Roman Church; my present concern is with their tendency."

Their tendency is not the question for a Divine, but their foundation in the revealed truth of Heaven. There are a variety of other differences which he passes over, but to magnify or to adduce which is not my object. I shall always be happy to find our differences diminish. However, merely to show how little this man's statements respecting doctrine are to be depended upon; the doctrines of purgatory and of indulgences, upon which he lays so much stress, rest altogether for their basis upon our doctrine of justification. And certainly the question whether an Unitarian or a Roman Catholic commits a sin in feeding a hungry pagan, or clothing a shivering Greek, through mere motives of humanity, is one on which there is more than a mere verbal difference between the Church of England and ours. The Church of England as does also that of Bishop Kemp, and indeed the Churches of all our assailants teach, that this act has in it the nature of sin; our Church teaches that it has not in it the nature of sin, but the nature of virtue, page 88.

"To begin with tradition: let us observe how broad a field is opened to the exercise of infallibility, by the supposition that an indefinite number of revealed truths were floating down the stream of ages, unconsigned to the inspired records of Christianity. The power of interpreting the word of God by a continual light from above, might be confined by the Scriptures themselves, as it would be difficult to force doctrines on the belief of Christians, of which the very name and subject seem to have been unknown to the inspired writers. Divine tradition, the first-born of infallibility, removes this obstacle; and, so doing, increases the influence of Rome to an indefinite extent. I do not here contend that to place tradition upon the same footing with the Scriptures,

is an error; but whether error or truth, it is certainly power in the hands of the Roman Church."

I before remarked that White and his associates have disclaimed the use of argument: therefore I have here nothing to refute, but I have much to correct.

The supposition which he makes is gratuitous and untrue. When he undertook to exhibit what tradition was, he ought to have been honest. Tradition is the testimony of the revealed truth which exists in customs, documents, and other evidence besides the sacred Scriptures, which evidence is found in every age of the Church, and in every nation; it is then, not "an indefinite number of revealed truths floating down the stream of ages," but it is the testimony of the whole Church, exhibiting what is revealed truth. Thus the universal custom of all the Churches in every age, to pay the homage of *adoration to the Redeemer*, is not consigned to the inspired records of Christianity, but is testified by other records of Christianity; and joined to the undoubted principle of Christians in every age and every nation, that *God alone should be adored*, is traditionary proof of the divinity of our Saviour. Whilst contending sects fly to grammars, and to old and new parchments and papers, how copyists marked, introduced or omitted accents, or divided particles and words—and whilst they array private individual judgment, and oppose conjecture to conjecture: we have a glaring fact in palpable evidence, and we pay the homage of our adoration with humble faith; whilst they are interminably quarrelling to know whether God inspired the writer to place or to omit his accent or his aspirate, and to know how it ought to be translated in either supposition. No doctrine is forced on the belief of Christians save what God originally forced, if I may use the expression, every one to receive: Scripture itself, and the very last passage that ever an inspired penman wrote, testifies that God taught doctrines and did acts which are not written by the inspired writers; but it is dishonest to insinuate that what has not been written by them, was unknown to them. We will readily admit, that the power of interpreting is power, as the power of testifying is also power. But it is strange to tell us that whatever bestows power must be dangerous to truth, at the same time, that it is avowed [that] Christ told the original members of this tribunal "all power is given to me in heaven and on earth." (*Matt.* xxviii, 18, 19, 20). "As my Heavenly Father sent me, so I send you," (*John* xx, 21,). "You shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you, and you shall be witnesses to me." (*Acts* i, 8,).

I shall return to this.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXXVI.

CHARLESTON, S. C., May 14, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—The leading characteristic of that portion of what is ludicrously designated as *Evidence*, which is now under consideration, is an unhesitating assumption of the very question at issue. The question is, whether the true doctrine of Christ is retained by our Church, or has been lost by us. White assumes, without proof, that we have lost it; and then proceeds to show the bad consequences of this loss: in the exhibition of those consequences he again begs the question, by assuming that what many others, as well as Protestants as Catholics, look upon to be good and useful, are bad and mischievous effects: he adds to this double fallacy, a dishonest blending together into what he insinuates to be an inseparable unity, facts and circumstances which are sometimes accidentally conjoined, which are frequently found in separate existence, and never have been necessarily and essentially united. The following passage is an exhibition of this dishonest and fallacious mode of proceeding: page 89:

"By the combined influence of tradition and infallibility, the Church of Rome established the doctrine of Transubstantiation. From the moment that people are made to believe that a man has the power of working at all times, the stupendous miracle of converting bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, that man is raised to a dignity above all which kings are able to confer. What, then, must be the honor due to a Bishop, who can bestow the power of performing the miracle of transubstantiation? What the rank of the Pope, who is the head of the Bishops themselves? The world beheld for centuries the natural consequences of the surprising belief in the power of priests to convert bread and wine into the incarnate Deity. Kings and Emperors were forced to kiss the Pope's foot, because their subjects were in the daily habit of kissing the hands of priests—those hands which were believed to come in frequent contact with the body of Christ."

The question as to the truth of our doctrine is not here even glanced at, but its falsehood is magisterially assumed: and the whole series of observations is made to rest upon a palpable falsehood, viz. "By the combined influence of tradition and infallibility, the Church of Rome established the doctrine of Transubstantiation." Had the writer substituted the following or an equivalent proposition for what he has here given, I should have admitted its truth, viz. "By the evidence of tradition, and with the authority of infallible truth, the Church teaches the

doctrine of Transubstantiation." Yet this proposition, though true as far as it goes, would be inadequate to express the whole of the facts, because although the Church produces the evidence of Tradition, she does not rest solely upon that proof even conjoined with her infallibility; she has morever the evidence of the Scriptures, she has the testimony of her adversaries, and she has the evidence of numerous, palpable, and continued miracles. Thus this fundamental proposition upon which White rests his observations, is false, because it is imperfect; for it exhibits but a small portion of our proofs as the entire: and because it conceals that which he esteems the most valuable, and exhibits only that which he deems to be of least worth.

The proposition is false upon another ground; because it gives a deceptive view of the mode in which the doctrine is preserved and delivered. There are two descriptions of evidence by which truth is made clear; to wit, that evidence by which what was never known or suspected is for the first time discovered, and its truth becomes thus established. Akin to this is the evidence by which what was formerly known but forgotten, becomes revived and established: under this head we may also place that evidence by which doubt is removed, and certainty obtained after a considerable lapse of time, or protracted investigation. In all those cases, ignorance or doubt pre-existed to knowledge and certainty. When the ignorance is overcome, and the doubt is removed, then evidence establishes the truth, and at every moment subsequent to that of this establishment, it will be true that a correct doctrine was then established.

The preservation of the truth thus discovered, and thus established, is a very different process from the original investigation and discovery. To preserve knowledge by correct testimony, is not then to establish knowledge by investigation and discovery. It is plain that the doctrine of Transubstantiation, supposing it to be that taught by the Saviour, was established only by his teaching and by that of his Apostles; the testimony of the Church is the mode by which it is preserved, or by which we establish the fact that Christ taught the doctrine; this uniform and uninterrupted and universal testimony we call Tradition; when we say that this testimony must infallibly lead us to a correct knowledge of what Christ and his Apostles taught, this is Infallibility. Thus it is not true that "by the combined influence of Tradition and Infallibility, the Church of Rome established the doctrine of Transubstantiation," for the doctrine was not established by the Church, but by the Saviour. But it is true that by their combination the doctrine and its evidence are both preserved; and I am at a loss to know what better mode could be

devised for their preservation than the uninterrupted, uniform testimony of the Universal Church of eighteen ages and almost all nations; I must own that it weighs more with me, than does the opinion of Bishop Kemp, the sturdiness of Doctor Post, or the warlike impetuosity of the Reverend Wm. Hawley.

The proposition which forms the ground work of the paragraph is then a double falsehood; and the galaxy of our divines have adopted it in their holy ardor against Popery. As Gustavus Vasa said to his Dalecarlians: "O how I admire their lovely, fierce impatience!" Show them but a rag of scarlet, and like the spurning bull, each hero bellows as he shakes his neck, and pushes with his frontlet. Their eagerness for the overthrow of Antichrist leads them to the thoughtless, indiscriminate adoption of all the means which their evil genius places within their grasp, and thus they become partners in the falsehoods and follies of the worst and weakest of our assailants. "From the moment that people are made to believe that a man has the power of working at all times the stupendous miracle of converting bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ; that man is raised to a dignity above all which kings are able to confer." This being better expressed would be true; as it stands, it is to say the least, very doubtful. Suppose the man had the power though the people should never be made to believe that he had it, he still is raised to the dignity; and if the people were made to believe that he had this power which he really did not possess, he would not be raised to the dignity: so that the dignity depends not upon the belief of the people which might be founded on delusion, but upon the existence of a power, which could be derived only from God. Nor is it strange that the king of heaven should raise his ministers to a higher dignity than earthly kings are able to confer; so that the eternal evidence here tells rather against White, who pays his court to his Majesty of England, and the good sovereigns of the European holy alliance in rather an awkward manner, by insinuating that it is a proof of the falsehood of our doctrine, that God's minister is raised to a higher dignity than a king's minister.

It certainly is to me a novelty to discover that the dignity of ministers is to be in the inverse ratio of their principles. Will Bishop Kemp and his associates strike their oriflamme to the flag of the beloved Ferdinand? The holy fathers would not: they all united in the declaration that the dignity of the priesthood, in consequence of that very power of consecration, was superior to that not only of kings themselves, but even of angels and archangels. These however, were the Chrysostoms, the Augustines, the Jeromes, the Basils, the Gregorys, the Prospers, the

Clements, and such other antiquated personages. Men who lived before the discovery of the art of printing, before the invention of the mariner's compass, before the construction of the blow-pipe, previous to the polygamy of King Henry VIII (the godly Josias,) or even to the days of the wise men of Gotham. Must we therefore be satisfied that they were ignorant of what Christ taught the Apostles, and the Apostles communicated to the Churches, and the Churches in their day exhibited as their uniform doctrine? We however will be content to believe with those holy fathers that the dignity of the Priesthood is above all which kings are able to confer, though like them we may rest in dull, lethargic insensibility to General Smith's Apocalyptic calculations, or Symes's theory of concentric spheres, or the exact moment when Johanna's Shiloh is to make his appearance, or when Rabbi Frey who writes in the capacious receptacle of his own conscience, all the contradictions of the sponsors of Blanco White, shall have obtained money enough to purchase his brethren according to the flesh to brotherhood in spirit.

But to be serious: this language of White's contradicts the language of the Fathers; and he charges upon us as consequences of false doctrine, the exact result which they drew from what they called the doctrine of Christ. It might be antiquated and unfashionable: but it is ours, and it was that of the whole body of the writers of the best, the brightest, and the earliest ages of the Church. White has left their communion; we glory that we adhere to it, and that we believe as they did. White proves here, for us, that we have not changed the doctrine.

One little correction is all that I shall add upon this topic. If we were to believe that priests had a natural power to make this change themselves, it would be indeed a surprising belief: but our faith is that it is the supernatural power of the Deity which effects the change of substance, but by the act of the priest; and if White were a member of the Church of England, he would believe that an unbaptized child was stained with the guilt of original sin; was a child of wrath, and exposed to ruin: he would also believe that if he baptized that child, a most surprising change would take place, by virtue whereof that sin would no longer exist, that child would be a favorite of heaven and have a title to everlasting life and glory. White would tell me that this change was not the consequence of natural operation, but of supernatural power; that though the man was a minister, in truth God was the agent, and that the change was not the less real and effectual because it was not visible, or otherwise sensible; his word "surprising" is not then applicable solely to the Eucharist, nor is it new, for it is at least as old as

St. John Chrysostom, who believing as we do, used the phrase fourteen centuries ago, regarding transubstantiation.

The concluding passage is not true in fact, nor honestly constructed, even if the facts taken in their isolated character should be proved as true. Suppose the two assertions were proved to be true, viz. that the subjects of kings and emperors were in the habit of kissing the hands of the priests, and that kings and emperors were forced to kiss the Pope's foot, the truth of the facts would not be sufficient for the truth of the proposition; it should be moreover shewn that the latter fact was a consequence of the former, for such is the assertion, "because their subjects were in the daily habit of kissing the hands of the priests." This is not only a gratuitous assumption, but it is a false assertion. It is next to impossible for me to prove a negative, and therefore, I can here only do as I have done frequently before in the course of these letters: pledge myself to meet any of the reverend gentlemen whose glove I have taken up, should he attempt to prove the truth of what I deny. I do not deny that kings and emperors and their subjects did occasionally kiss the hands of Priests and Bishops: but I do deny that the monarchs were forced to kiss the Pope's foot, either because the people kissed the hands of the priests, or because the hands of the clergy were believed to come in contact with the body of Christ. Thus this paragraph contains several falsehoods, and charges us with deviating from the doctrine of Christ, whilst in endeavoring to maintain its position, it proves that our doctrine agrees with that of the great Fathers of the Church and of the early Christians.

He throws a note upon this subject into his Appendix, which I shall next come to consider. He begins with the following paragraph, page 242:

"*Transubstantiation.*—An accurate and detailed history of the rise and gradual progress of the doctrine of Transubstantiation would be a valuable contribution to the philosophy of the human mind. What appears to me most deserving the attention of philosophical observers, is the concurrence of two perfectly unconnected errors, in giving birth to this intellectual monster."

I once heard of a treatise written *de omni re scibili, et quibuslibet aliis,* "concerning every thing which may be known, and some other things;" such would be the accurate and detailed history of the rise and gradual progress of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, unless it was combined with that of the rise and gradual progress of the doctrine of Christ; the history ought to be given if it could: and as the writer

of the note attempts its outline, I shall follow him in his philosophical observations:

"The natural propensity of mankind to refer their worship of the invisible to the symbols employed to express it, is found even among the early Christians. A great reverence for the bread and wine, which, in the words of the Saviour, were called his flesh and blood, far from being to blame in them, must be viewed as a direct consequence of the certainty they possessed, that the Eucharist had been established by the Son of God. But here the usual process of the vulgar mind began. Abstractions and distinctions are difficult and painful to the generality of mankind. The spiritual presence of Christ, the intimate connexion between an external and simple act of eating and drinking, and the influence of his grace on the soul of those who eat and drink by faith in his death and passion, was soon lost sight of. Though Christ himself had declared that 'the flesh profiteth nothing,' the bread and wine gradually assumed the character of his material flesh and blood. Yet neither the people nor their leaders were able to use any definite language upon the mysterious work of consecration."

This is beginning philosophical inquiry with a vengeance! In his first three lines, he most illogically begs the question, by assuming that the Eucharist is not what it is, and he most irreverently charges the early Christians with a propensity to idolatrous worship. "The natural propensity of mankind to refer their worship of the invisible to the symbols employed to express it, is found even among the early Christians." The philosopher has already doné much to prove that the Church of Christ became idolatrous at a very early period; or else that our doctrine of what he is pleased to call worshipping the symbols, is not idolatrous! He next calls "bread and wine" what the Saviour, he tells us, calls "his flesh and blood." The philosopher begins pretty clearly in this place to lay his foundation for differing with the expressions of the Saviour; as he had previously condemned the worship of his disciples; but he does not blame them for having a great reverence for the "bread and wine," since this reverence is a direct consequence of the Eucharist having been established by the Son of God. But the philosopher would, I suppose, upon the same principle, not blame them for having equal reverence for "water," since baptism in water has been with equal certainty established by the Son of God. Yet we find the early Christians pay no such reverence to the water in which they were baptized, as to what the Saviour calls "his flesh and blood." Thus we do not find amongst the early Christians the same propensity "to refer their worship of the invisible to all the symbols employed to express

it." Our philosopher will, I trust, admit the correctness of our logic in rejecting parity of consequence, where analogy does not exist, and in deducing similar conclusions where that analogy is found, and in not drawing universal conclusions from particular premises: he must therefore admit that, if we do not find worship paid to the water of baptism, and we do not find it paid to the symbols of the Eucharist, there must be a very great difference between the nature of each symbol in the estimation of the early Christian; also that as both were equally established by the Son of God, and one was worshipped, whilst the other was not, the great reverence which was paid to what "the Saviour called his flesh and blood" did not arise merely from the certainty that the Eucharist had been established by the Son of God, but did arise from some other cause, which was not to be found in baptism.

His next passage is worse than insulting to the Christian Church. Good God! my friends, what kind of Christianity can that be, which can only be built upon the abuse and vilifying of the best, the earliest, and the most faithful disciples of Christ. "Vulgar minds." Such has always been the language of vain, empty and petulant philosophists, when describing the true followers of Christ during eighteen centuries. The whole host of confused theologists, who have bewildered themselves and their followers with such unintelligible jargon as the remainder of this pasage contains, have ever been so entangled upon this subject, that I must avow my "vulgar mind" could not catch at the ideas, if any, which their words convey. I can understand what it is to eat bread and drink wine, and to believe that Christ died to save me, and to hope for his grace, and to trust that I might be animated by his Spirit; but I cannot understand how I can eat a body which is not present, nor drink blood which is not in my mouth. I do not understand what is the idea of eating by faith; I can understand what believing by faith means, but eating is an act of the body, and believing is an act of the mind; and to believe is not to eat, as every one may easily experience. It is not a subject upon which to indulge levity, or I should give abundant demonstration. I shall have another opportunity of showing that Christ's flesh profits much by its immolation upon the cross, and that the meaning of the Saviour is here shamefully distorted. It is false, that there was no definite language used by the people and their leaders upon the mysterious work of consecration. Mark, then, the retreat of the philosopher: "The first Christians did not know the nature of the Eucharist." Is this the result of philosophy? "The first Christians did not know the doctrine of Christ." I shall continue the examination.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXXVII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., May 21, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—In my last I merely alluded to the passage of White's note, in which he states that "Though Christ himself had declared that 'the flesh profiteth nothing,' the bread and wine gradually assumed the character of his material flesh and blood." I shall now take up that passage more at length. We must in the first instance see what was the error of the Capharnaites which the Saviour corrected. The transaction is related in the sixth chapter of *St. John's Gospel*, and in this place the redeemer declared repeatedly that his flesh was meat indeed, and his blood was drink indeed, and that the bread which he would give was his flesh for the life of the world: he assured them that except they eat of the flesh of the Son of man and drank his blood they could not have life in them. Many of the people of Capharnaum apprehended that they were to receive his body as they used to receive meat at the shambles, and complained that this saying was hard, and who could bear it? The early writers testify to this to have been the erroneous impression of this people. This is what we understand by eating material flesh and blood: the Roman Catholic Church believes that Christ did not intend to give his material flesh and blood thus to be taken, in this disgusting manner. Our bodies in their natural or material state, are in a very different mode of existence to what they will be in their supernatural or spiritualized state, after the resurrection; as the Apostle St. Paul testifies; where he informs the Corinthians that what is sown is a corruptible body, what rises is an incorruptible body; what is sown is a natural body, what rises is a spiritual body. The Roman Catholic Church believes that the body of Christ in the Eucharist is not in the natural, corruptible, passible, animal state; but in the supernatural, incorruptible, impassible, spiritualized state in which glorified bodies shall be after their resurrection, and in which his own body is since his resurrection.—And thus, although we know very little of the properties, and nothing of the nature of the human body in its natural or material state, we know still less of its properties in that supernatural or spiritualized state: it is therefore ridiculous presumption for us to argue upon a case of which we know so little: but reason tells us that respecting the body of Christ, we act correctly in receiving the testimony of God, who fully knows its nature in all its states. We know that the same identical bodies which we have will arise from the dead, although they shall have been first resolved to dust, but we know not how this will be effected: yet we

know by revelation that we shall arise in the same bodies, not in newly created bodies; thus, although the body will be changed in its mode of existence, it will still be the same, now natural, material, then spiritualized; now corruptible, then incorruptible. So the Catholic Church believes that in the Eucharist is found the same identical body of Christ, which was material in its natural state, now spiritualized in its supernatural state. She does not teach the doctrine of the Capharnaites; on the contrary she condemns it; hence White and his sponsors allege what is not true when they assert, that we make "bread and wine assume the character of his material flesh and blood." It is but one of their ordinary calumnies to impute to us the errors which we condemn in others. And the words of the Saviour are by us applied as they were by himself to condemn the error of the Capharnaites. There was either a want of generosity, or injuctice, or of knowledge in those who wrote and those who published this note, I cannot determine which. I have before remarked upon the falsehood of his concluding passage, "yet neither the people nor their leaders were able to use any definite language upon the mysterious work of consecration." No person indeed can tell how the God of Heaven produces the change, but all know by his own declaration the fact that he does produce it, and all antiquity is full of testimonies of their belief. At this day, if we are asked to tell exactly what is the nature of a spiritualized and glorified body, we must avow that we cannot tell; the most erudite physician cannot tell us the nature of a material body; he can inform us of several of its qualities and properties, which he has learned from observation, experience, and the testimony of other men; we can tell him some of the qualities and properties of spiritualized bodies which we have learned by the testimony of God, which is to say the least, as good a criterion of the truth, as is the observation and experience and testimony of man. I know not how the Eucharist change is effected, but neither do I know how the mysterious operations of nature are produced: when our opponents shall have explained to me how seeds are produced in trees and herbs, when they shall have informed me how animal life is produced, communicated and extinguished, I shall explain to them the "mysterious work of consecration."

I shall now proceed to another paragraph of our investigating philosopher: and if we had not in *Doblado's Letters* seen abundant evidence by his own avowal, of his neglect of study, the passages which are now to pass in review, would be sufficient to lead us to the same conclusion.

"It happened, however, in the metaphysical ages (such name, I believe, would suit the period between the twelfth and the sixteenth cen-

turies) that every system which successively occupied the attention of the schools, had an effect not unlike that which is now produced by physical discoveries, though upon very dissimilar objects. A newly discovered law or power of nature, in our days, puts the whole mass of European intellect into motion: a thousand applications are tried, ten thousand hopes of improvement are raised, till the effervescence is sobered down by experience and failure. A new metaphysical system produced in those times a similar state of mind, among the class who pursued abstract knowledge, with regard to the objects of their favorite studies, and that without any thing to check it. Platonism first, and then Aristotleism were believed to be sufficient to explain every mystery in theology. The success, however, of the latter was unrivalled in defining, explaining, and demonstrating the as yet indistinct and fluctuating theory of the Eucharist."

Upon this passage I shall make but few observations; first, he might have very properly stated the commencement of this period a century or two earlier: second, though the schoolmen applied their ingenuity to explain the doctrines of theology by their philosophical systems, they never believed or taught that those systems would be sufficient to explain any one of the mysteries, so as to demonstrate its truth by reason, and make it cease to be mysterious and above the comprehension of the human mind: this point is easily settled: the position of White and of the holy alliance will be fully established, and I shall be completely refuted, by their producing names and works of those who made such statements; these vague assertions will not answer. The last passage is a distinct untruth, in as much as it asserts that it was believed that by means of Aristotelic philosophy, the doctrine of the Eucharist could be demonstrated, and in as much as it asserts that the theory; doctrine, (I know of no theory of the Eucharist) was before or at that time either indistinct or fluctuating: for in those ages as well as in the preceding centuries the doctrine was distinct, settled, and universally received, that at the consecration the substance of the bread and wine ceased to be under the appearances, and the body and blood of Christ were really and substantially present, under the appearances. In those ages it is true, metaphysicians began to inquire and to discuss in what manner the change was effected, but that it was effected they were agreed, for such was the doctrine that had come down from the Apostles, and was found in all the Churches, Latin, Greek, Nestorian, Eutychian, and all throughout the East and the West. The metaphysical question concerning the manner in which the change was effected, is a very different one from that which must have preceded, if the doctrine were fluctuating: for the

schoolmen were sufficiently acute to know according to one of their own axioms that the question of fact is previous to that of mode, and they would have investigated whether a change actually did take place, before entering upon the examination of the manner in which that change occurred. The schoolmen adhered more rigidly to the rules of sound logic than White has done, or dared to do with the case which he attempts to support. The schoolmen were seldom found begging the question, or deliberately writing palpable untruths under the guise of religious zeal: not so with the author of the *Evidence* who is comparable

> To Sir Agrippa, for profound
> And solid lying much renown'd.

And as the next paragraph will show,

> For mystic learning, wondrous able
> In magic talisman and cabal.
> By help of these, as he profess'd,
> He had first matter seen undress'd:
> He took her naked all alone,
> Before one rag of form was on.
> The Cahos too, he had descried
> And seen quite through, er else he lied,
> Beside, he was a shrewd philosopher
> And had read every text and gloss over;
> He Antroposophus and Floud,
> And Jacob Behmen understood.

Mark his erudition in the following passage:

"One of the doctrines introduced by the Aristotelian system of the school, is that of substantial forms or absolute accidents.[20] The school-men suppose that the universe consists of a mass of matter invested by certain forms or qualities which possess a real and substantial being. This was a lucky discovery for the school divines. It explained the bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament. The substance of the bread and wine, they said, is converted into his body and blood; but the absolute accidents, the substantial forms of both remain as before.—Hence the word *transubstantiation.*"

The schoolmen are here either not understood by our learned philosopher, or he plays Sir Agrippa with them. There is often to be found amongst our modern philosophers an overweening contempt for their predecessors of the period to which White has alluded. I can have no pretensions to rush into the ranks of the mighty men of mind who adorn

[20] The Schoolmen have foisted many of their absurdities upon the Greek philosopher. From the definition which Aristotle gives of matter, it is evident that he considered that word as the sign of an abstraction. '*Materia est neque quid, neque quantum, nec aliud eorum quibus ens denominatur.*' I quote the translation used among the schoolmen.

the present age. They have carried forward the discoveries in natural philosophy of the laborious and scientific pioneers who have removed many obstacles which impeded the progress of man in the regions of air, of earth and of ocean. As White very properly remarks, this may very justly be called the epoch of the investigation and improvement of physical science. At a great distance I admire the men who so assiduously and successfully cultivate the field of knowledge; my destiny, perhaps my taste, and occasionally, it may be, my duty drew me in another direction. I have gone amongst the schoolmen and conversed with them in the dust in which they slept; having roused them from their slumbers, and brushed away the cobweb drapery in which they were enfolded, I was left almost in solitude to learn their opinions and to receive their testimony. It was fashionable to laugh at them; they were made objects of ridicule: and to sneer at the schoolman was to an idle or a brainless youth, a more agreeable or easy occupation than to read, to understand, or refute him: language has changed, and in the lapse of time the variation of phrases and their translation have given ideas altogether different from those which the scholastic writer intended to convey. The dignified baron and the chivalrous knight of the 13th century would have abundant theme for descant on the lisping fopling who might strut or slide through a modern drawing room. There is no period in which man in his civilized state does not exhibit in society a blending of what is respectable and contemptible. In the days of the schoolmen, the minds of the learned were not directed to the same objects which now occupy the attention of our men of information, and could the dunces of former ages see the labors of our best philosophers, they would lament, or affect to pity the ignorance of men whose productions they were unable to estimate, just as the thoughtless and ignorant of to-day sneer at schoolmen of whose valuable works they have scarcely an idea. I do not think it useful to literature, to cast away with contempt what has been the result of the disquisition and investigation of powerful intellect at any former period. I would prefer seeing the correction of the errors or mistakes of our ancestors added to their knowledge and our acquirements, rather than to witness the childish disregard of every thing they knew because their system of natural philosophy was imperfect, and their expressions were too formal, and are now antiquated. This foolish fashion of treating them with contempt, has deprived us of much valuable matter which they had collected and arranged in their own way, and I must avow, however my nameless self might suffer from the avowal, that I look upon their metaphysics to ex-

ceed that of most of our moderns as much as our knowledge of physics exceeds theirs.

White is either ignorant of their language or studiously misrepresents its meaning; he plays upon the word substantial, and is guilty of a dishonest quibble in its use, or he knows nothing of the language of schoolmen. The only difference which exists between us and them, is in the mode of expression. In our language at present, substantial does not mean what it did in the schools; and any person who would attach to the word in the schools the same meaning which it has in present common usage would be grossly in error. In the schools it means real, not chimerical. Appearances or secondary qualities of bodies which affect our senses, are by modern philosophers said to be nothing in the body, but are effects produced by the body upon us; thus heat, according to some, is a sensation of the soul produced by the disposition of the parts of that body which is said to be hot. I find several bodies of unlike substance but of the same temperature; iron, brass, lead, stone, cotton are all different substances, but all have the same degree of heat. The schoolman said that the accident of heat existed absolutely in each of them, that they all had the same substantial form of heat: a modern will tell you that they all emit the same quantity of caloric: another will tell you that they are all so configured as to produce the same sensation of heat: in fact they are but different modes of expressing the same idea; the expression being accommodated to the philosophical theory of the day, which theory is as yet fluctuating and unsettled. White then asserts what is not the fact when he informs his readers that the schoolmen supposed the "forms of qualities" to possess a real and "substantial being" if by substantial he would have us believe any thing different from or beyond what the modern mean by the same real existence of those qualities. I shall give an illustration. In the book of Josue it is stated that an angel appeared to that leader, in the shape of a warrior: there was here an angelic substance clothed with human appearance. The schoolman would say, the substance of a man was not there, but the substantial form or absolute accidents of a man were there, and clothed the angelic substance which was really there: thus the figure, color, and so forth, of a human being existed where the substance did not: a modern philosopher would tell you that those secondary qualities cannot exist but in the substance of a human being, that therefore as the substance of a human being was not here, these accidents which can exist only in that substance did not exist here: but he acknowledges that the angelic substance was really there, and that God miraculously caused the impressions upon the senses of Josue to be the same as if

the substance of a human being and not that of an angel were present. Thus the modern and the ancient differ only in their mode of expressing the same identical idea, which is "the substance of an angel appeared as that of man." Before the doctrine of substantial forms or absolute accidents found its way into the schools, Christians believed that Christ was really present in the Eucharist by virtue of a change produced by God: when this philosophy prevailed, the schoolmen said that the substance was changed, but the absolute accidents remained: when a new philosophy succeeded, it was still taught [that] the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ; but [that] after consecration, God produces upon our senses the same impressions by the new substance that he would by the old, if no change had taken place; thus all the parade of our philosopher is of no avail; the same idea was still expressed in other terms suited to the age: the doctrine remained unchanged. I doubt if many members of the holy alliance have seen it before, but White does not understand Aristotle's definition of the matter. Upon his next paragraph I shall make little comment: it is the following:

"The idea of a general mass shaped by these substantial forms or moulds, is so agreeable to the external impressions of mankind, and so analogous to the operations by which what we call materials are converted into objects fitted for peculiar uses; that the words in which the school philosophers expressed them, have been incorporated with all the European languages." [21]

The good gentleman, I am convinced, knows just as little of the scholastic authors, and of the Aristotelic philosophy, as he does of the materials of the moon. I shall leave him and Bishop Kemp to get, as well as they can, out of transubstantiation of their own Churches. Of one thing I must avow my own perfect ignorance, upon which perhaps, some one might condescend to inform me, viz. "What is the doctrine of the Church of England or what is the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States respecting the nature of the Eucharist." Do they believe the doctrine of the real presence? If they do, which is it, by consubstantiation with the Lutherans, or by transubstantiation with the Greeks and Latins? If they do not believe the real presence of Christ's body how can they eat it? Can we eat what they

[21] "It is curious to trace to the same source even the word elements, which seems to have been chosen by the Protestants as the most independent from the theory of conceived to bear the qualities of things. *Omnium elementa possunt invicem in se transmutari, non generatione, sed alteratione.* The bread and wine were *elements* because they were supposed to be changed into the body and blood of Christ. See Brucker, *Hist. Philos.* part ii, lib. ii, c. vii."

have not present? What is the difference between eating and believing? Do the two phrases mean the same, "I eat," "I believe"? How could the word elements be chosen to avoid expressing transubstantiation, if bread and wine were called elements because they were supposed to be changed into the body and blood of Christ? I can understand the doctrine of Zuinglius, who says that after consecration there is only what was before; but that in eating the bread and drinking the wine, you eat and drink what you have present, viz. bread and wine, that in doing so you may call to mind a former occurrence, and that for doing so, you may receive grace from God: but this is not eating Christ's body. I can understand the doctrine of the Catholic Church, which says that at the consecration although no apparent change occurs, yet a substantial change takes place, and now Christ's body and blood assume the appearance of bread and wine, or have the substantial forms, or absolute accidents of those substances or matters: in this case I eat Christ's body which is present, but I eat not bread which has ceased to be present, and I only require the power of God to perform the change, which is within that power. I can understand the doctrine of the Lutheran Church which states that the body of Christ is placed together with the substance of the bread under its appearance, for in this case I can conceive two substances, under one appearance; it requires more extensive miraculous interference than does the Catholic doctrine, because it requires that two bodies shall occupy the same space; but in this case the communicant eats the body of Christ, as also bread, because both are present. But I cannot understand the person who tells me; "You eat what is not present, you eat Christ's body although it is not there." Nor is the proposition made intelligible by informing me that the mode in which I eat the absent body is by Faith, because faith is belief, and eating and believing are not in fact synonymous. Hence I have always looked upon the doctrine of Bishop Kemp's Church on this sacrament to be too abstruse for my conception, or to be sheer nonsense: it might however be owing to my own stupidity.

We now come to the last paragraph of the note, page 245:

"That the doctrine of transubstantiation could not have been established without the aid of Aristotle, any one who examines the technical words of the Roman Catholic divines, upon that question, will readily perceive. Of this they were so fully convinced but a short time ago, that I recollect the opposition to which the modern system of natural philosophy was still subject in my youth, as depriving the Roman Catholic faith of its chief support, by the rejection of the substantial forms. Indeed, transubstantiation conveys either no meaning at all,

or one entirely the reverse of what Rome intends; unless we suppose the separableness of substance, and forms or qualities. The substance of the bread and wine, it is said, is converted into the body and blood of Christ, which, translated into any language but that of the schools, means that the body of Christ (I wish to speak reverently) chemically analyzed in the consecrated bread and wine, will be found to consist of every thing which constitutes bread and wine, i. e. the body and blood of Christ will be found to have been converted into real bread and wine. What else do we designate by bread and by wine but two aggregates of qualities, identical to what the analytical process will show after consecration? Substance without qualities is a mere abstraction of the mind; with qualities, it is that which the qualities make it. So here we have a mighty miracle to convert Christ into bread and wine; for such would be the substance of his body if it changed its qualities for those of the two well known compounds which the Roman Catholics adore. If it is said that Christ occupies the place of the bread and wine, and produces the impressions peculiar to them on the senses, the supposed miracle should change the name of transubstantiation into that of delusion. Surely transubstantiation has for its basis the most absurd philosophical system which ever disgraced the schools of a barbarous age!"

The first proposition here is altogether untrue, upon the old maxim of the schoolmen, *ab actu ad posse valet consecutio.* The doctrine was established long before the aid of Aristotle was sought to explain its philosophy. Ages succeeding ages saw it spread through nations before the principles of the Greek philosopher were applied to the subject; and it now exists where that philosopher has been rejected, of which the self-contradicting White himself bears evidence in this very passage; for he admits that the modern system of philosophy co-existed with the belief in the Spanish universities, though some advocates of the Aristotelic system raised the difficulties which he states. Did he deny what he here admits, I am prepared with abundant evidence to show the co-existence of the doctrine of transubstantiation, and of the modern theory of natural philosophy in the great majority of European universities, and in some of them long before the birth of White, who avows his own idleness, and consequently his own ignorance. Some of the most steady believers in the doctrine have been some of the best contributors to modern science in France, in Italy, in Germany, and even in Spain itself.

But of all the miserable attempts to put on the semblance of learning that ever fell under my eye, the following is the most abject. "What do we designate by bread and wine but two aggregates of qualities iden-

tical to what the analytical process will show after consecration.'' And this is the man who laughed at substantial forms and absolute accidents! Surely he ought to have known that bread and wine are substances, and not qualities, nor aggregates of qualities! ! ! Bread is an aggregate of identical qualities! ! Bless him for the discovery! He has at last gone beyond my reach, ''substance without qualities is a mere abstraction of the mind.'' Granted, good Sir; and so are qualities without substance, or as the old schoolmen would call them absolute accidents, also an abstraction of the mind; and yet White gives us this abstraction, this aggregate of qualities for bread! ''With qualities, it is that which the qualities make it.'' By no means, good Sir; it is the substance which produces the qualities, or, if you will, make them; and not they that make the substance.

You must, in all natural cases, have the substance of gold before you will have its color, gravity, taste, and so forth. It is not the taste and smell which make the wine, but the wine which makes, or produces, or causes them. Such is the case according to the laws of nature, and hence, though the qualities do not make the substance, we will generally, but not universally arrive at a knowledge of the substance itself, by ascertaining what the qualities are; this, I suspect, is what the philosopher was blundering to express, when he compiled this paragraph of jargon. I said this was not universally the case; for there are several instances where our knowledge is so limited, that we draw our inferences too hastily; the principle upon which they are drawn is analogy, and this is not the most easily ascertained, our observation is not sufficiently close, nor experience sufficiently extensive, nor acquaintance with nature sufficiently intimate to save us from mistakes, and those of the most serious, and not unfrequently of the most fatal description. But in miraculous cases, it is totally inapplicable. I shall instance but one or two. The ''aggregate of qualities'' in the apparition of the angel of Josue would lead to the conclusion, that the substance was that of man.[22] Did the qualities make the substance in this case? The ''aggregate of qualities'' would have made the Holy Ghost the substance of a dove in one instance;[23] and the substance of fire in another.[24] Will Bishop Kemp hold to the ''identical analytical process?'' In those cases, the substance was neither made nor detected by the qualities. And yet there was no delusion, because there was a mode afforded for discovering by the declaration of God and by faith, what could never have been detected or

[22] *Josue* v, 13.
[23] *John* i, 32.
[24] *Acts* ii, 3.

known by the unaided senses. But, mark the dishonesty of White, who set out in this paragraph by stating that our doctrine could not be established without the aid of Aristotle; and at its conclusion, gives its explanation by modern philosophy. "Christ occupies the place of the bread and wine, and produces the impressions peculiar to them on the senses." Thus he shows that he knowingly wrote what was not true. He however calls this delusion. What will he call the cases of the apparition of angels and of the Holy Ghost? It is not delusion; because we are informed that at the consecration a change is effected in substance, though not in appearance. God thus affords to us the means of knowing the fact; if we believe him there is no delusion; if we will not, we delude ourselves, and we are criminal; the fault is ours, not that of our Creator.

I may then conclude this letter by stating, that of all the wretched attempts of this man, that made by him in this note is the most unfortunate. It is, throughout, a combination of false imputations, unsound philosophy, undeserved sneers at men of extraordinary acquirements and great natural ability, confusion of ideas, a betrayal of ignorance and self-sufficiency, together with low blasphemy; and this is what the Right Rev. Bishop Kemp and the other members of the holy alliance recommended to their flocks, by way of sound instruction! Surely their doctrine has need of explanation, and it would be well for them, if it was as intelligible as is the philosophical system of what they are pleased to call a barbarous age.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXXVIII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., May 28, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—The next passage of White's that comes under our observation commences at page 89.

"The abundance of ceremonies supposed to produce supernatural effects, must magnify the character of the privileged ministers of those ceremonies. Hence a Church possessing seven sacraments, is far superior in influence to one who acknowledges but two. Add to this the nature of four out of five Roman sacraments—penance, extreme unction, ordination and matrimony—and the extent of power which she thereby obtains, will appear. Penance, i. e. auricular confession, puts the consciences of the laity under the direction of the priesthood. Extreme unction is one of her means to allay fear and remorse. Ordination is

intimately connected with the influence which the Roman Church derives from transubstantiation, and its being made a sacrament, adds probability to the miraculous powers which it is supposed to confer. Finally, by giving the sacramental character to matrimony the source and bond of civil society is directly and primarily subjected to the Church."

Upon this I have little to remark—the principle having been previously disposed of, viz. That the possession of power in the Church is evidence, "internal evidence," that ours is not the true Church of Christ, who said to his Apostles, and in their persons to the Church, "As my Father hath sent me, even so I send you."[25] "But that you may know the son of man hath power on earth," and so forth.[26] "They marvelled and glorified God which had given such power to men."[27] "And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power," and so forth.[28] "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth, go ye therefore, and teach all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."[29] Yet in the very teeth of those declarations, White and the holy alliance would tell us that her claim to spiritual power is internal evidence of the corruption of our Church: and there is not a single one of the sects to which they belong that does not claim and attempt to use more power over its members than any general council claims or uses in our Church. Suppose, then, I were to admit the truth of White's first proposition, what would be the consequence? That the clergy had more spiritual power, because their commission was more extensive. Is this untrue? No Christian will deny its truth, but even any rational man will say, that the important question is not whether the character is magnified or diminished, but whether any ecclesiastical ceremony is efficacious, and if so how many. The true question is, to what does the commission extend? Thus the very question which this man avoids is that which is important, and his rhapsody is but got up for creating prejudice, not for investigating truth: hence too his second proposition, and the whole sequel, are unfair and delusive. The number and the nature of the sacraments are to be known by inquiring what Christ instituted; not by asking what mankind may think of his bestowing character or conferring power.

It is untrue that penance is auricular confession, or that auricular confession is penance. I might as well assert that the Senate is the

[25] *John* xx, 21.
[26] *Matt.* ix, 6.
[27] *Ib.* ix, 8.
[28] *Matt.* x, 1.
[29] *Ib.* xxviii, 18, *et seq.*

Congress, the main spring is a watch, the rudder is a ship, or the axletree is a cart; in a word, that one of the parts of any thing is the whole of that of which it is a part. Penance consists of three parts on the side of the penitent, and one on that of the clergyman, that is, four parts in the whole: and confession is but one of those four parts, and very frequently the least necessary: so that it is a gross misrepresentation to identify penance and auricular confession in this offhanded mode in which the untruth is here put forward. I will suppose the case of a man who has committed a theft to a large amount, and contrived to shift the imputation of dishonesty upon an innocent father of a family, by which his reputation is destroyed and his family is ruined. This criminal may, however, through the merits of Christ's death, be forgiven by the sacrament of "penance, i. e. auricular confession." The impression which this conveys to the mind, is naturally that according to the tenets of our Church, the criminal has only to confess in the ear of a priest, and be forgiven. Such, I am aware, is the notion entertained by three or four millions of our enlightened fellow-citizens upon the subject. Yet an ignorant Spaniard would tell us that this was by no means sufficient amongst Catholics; that besides this confession, three other ingredients were necessary, viz. contrition and satisfaction on the part of the sinner, and absolution by the clergyman.

Thus, in the case stated, the crime is easily told—but, a true and sincere sorrow for having offended God, a sincere intention of avoiding future transgressions, and of flying from temptation, true and perfect repentance of heart, without which there can be no reconciliation with heaven, is generally the result of reflection, prayer, and the grace of the most high God. This first and essential requisite Mr. White altogether omits when he tells us "penance, [and] auricular confession," mean the same thing. Another ingredient of penance is satisfaction. In the case before us, the criminal is bound to restore the sum which he had originally stolen to the person upon whom the theft was committed; to make good to him all the losses which he sustained in consequence thereof, and if possible to compensate for the feelings of mortification, pain and bitterness which were endured. This is something more than "auricular confession." But he has a far more extensive and difficult task to perform—he must use every exertion to restore the character of the innocent man, who, by his contrivance, bore the punishment due to an offence which he did not commit: he must compensate him for his losses, he must endeavor to soothe his feelings: he must make reparation to his family. This is something more than "auricular confession." This explains the horror with which dishonest Catholics contemplate confes-

sion; this accounts for their readiness to unite with Protestants in decrying and vilifying the tribunal of penance, and the difference of their conduct as regards this sacrament is an almost infallible criterion by which to judge of their general observance of the code of Christian morality. Were there no obligation to do more than to make "auricular confession," there would be no difficulty in penance: but confession leads to satisfaction, and is useless unless accompanied by contrition or repentance, and the clergyman is answerable with his own soul at the bar of heaven for giving absolution, except where he has a moral certainty, after close examination, that the person to whom he gives it has all the proper dispositions: but even then the mistake of the priest will be no more security to the sinner than would be the sinner's own insincerity: unless he be truly penitent, and fully disposed to satisfy the justice of God and man, the absolution will be invalid, and his imperfect attempt will be a sacrilege. Thus, if auricular confession places the consciences of the laity under the direction of the priesthood; it also places those of the Pope, and of the Bishops, and of the Priests themselves, under the same control, for they must have recourse to the same tribunal for the same purpose, the remission of their sins; and the law of God is the great principle by which the director is to be guided, for when Christ breathed upon his Apostles and said to them, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted to them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained;"[30] he committed to them this power of remitting and retaining, to be exercised upon the principles of his moral and religious institutions, and not according to their individual caprice. As to their predecessors in the typical law of Moses, he gave a power of offering an atoning sacrifice after the confessions of the people, not upon their individual caprice, but in accordance with the great principles of that law of which he constituted them the judges.[31] That there exists power in this tribunal of penance, we do not deny, but we assert that it is a power bestowed by Christ, who is better able than we are to judge of the necessity and propriety of its bestowal: and it is a curious sort of logic which infers from the existence of power that our's could not be the Church of Christ, though we prove that the Saviour left such power in his Church. But whatever excuse the holy alliance in America might have for using the argument, it comes with a very bad grace from White, who calls himself a clergyman of the Church of England—one of whose rubrics is the following:

"Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession

[30] *John* xx, 22, 23.
[31] *Lev.* v, 5; *Num.* v, 7; *Deut.* xvii.

if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort:

"Our Lord Jesus Christ who hath left *power* to his Church to absolve all sinners which truly repent, and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences, and by his authority committed to me, I *absolve thee* from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen."

It is a little strange that White, a minister of the Church which declares Christ left this power to his Church, and who, by Christ's authority, is liable to be called upon for this exercise of power, should give us, as one of the topics of *Internal Evidence against Catholicism*, the claim of the Catholic Church to this power. What says Bishop Kemp to this? I am aware that his Church disclaims the power, but the Church of England claims it. But what says he to White's logic? What say the holy alliance to this argument of their adopted child? Before I leave this topic, I beg to remind Bishop Kemp that the first book of King Edward VI had this tailpiece to the above rubric:

"And the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions."

Thus in the time of Edward VI the English Protestant Church had private confession and absolution, of as strict necessity as in our Church. In the time of Elizabeth the confession and absolution were only necessary for the dying, subsequently the confession and absolution were left to the discretion of the sick person, and the American Protestant Episcopal Church got rid of them altogether: so that they could not all be following the institution of Christ: Will the holy alliance vouchsafe to inform us which of them was right?

Were I to argue against the Church of England, or against the Lutheran Church in Europe which preserves confession and absolution as White does against the Roman Catholic Church, I would feel humbled and degraded in my own estimation. I shall conclude this topic with the following extract from the *Cork Mercantile Chronicle*, an Irish paper, of the 2nd of last month, April, giving a portion of the assizes news in that city. The trial of the cause was held before Mr. Justice Torrens. De Lacour is the Treasurer of the County, and a Protestant.—Ryan is we believe a Catholic.

"*Ryan vs. De Lacour.*

"This was an action brought by the plaintiff to recover the sum of £408 from the defendant, being the amount of a presentment for building a bridge on the Mallow-road, and which came on last assizes,

but without being brought to any decision, a juror having been withdrawn.

"In the course of the proceedings this day, a man named Riordan, who was produced as a witness for the plaintiff, astonished the Court and the jury by his declaration. He swore that the present action was the result of a conspiracy against Mr. De Lacour; that he had perjured himself at the last assizes, and that other witnesses for the prosecution were perjurers; and that £20 a head was to be the payment for each perjurer. He said that he made this avowal now in consequence of the advice which he had received from the Rev. Mr. Cotter, the Roman Catholic Curate of Ballinamona, to whom he confessed his guilt, and who suggested the present mode of reparation. Riordan was committed for perjury on his own confession.

"At 5 o'clock a verdict was returned for the defendant, with 6d. costs."

What would Mr. De Lacour say to auricular confession putting the conscience of the laity under the direction of the priesthood? What do the holy alliance say to the restitution perpetually made in consequence of this direction? What say they to all the injustice and other crimes prevented by this direction? The God who established this doctrine knows more of human nature than they do.

"Extreme unction is one of her means to allay fear and remorse."

Unquestionably, when received with proper dispositions. But who made it so?

"Is any sick amongst you? Let him call in the priests of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick person, and the Lord will raise him up; and if he be in his sins they shall be forgiven to him."[32]

White before he wrote this passage, should have done as Luther did: this holy father of the Reformation denied the Epistle of St. James to be an inspired document: how have his followers admitted it? White should also have recollected, if ever he knew the fact, that the Protestant Church of England retained extreme unction as a divine institution.

"If the sick person desires to be anointed, then shall the Priest anoint him upon the forehead, or breast only, making the sign of the cross, saying thus:

"As with this visible oyl thy body is outwardly anointed: so our Heavenly Father, Almighty God, grant of his infinite goodness that thy

[32] *James*, v, 14.

soul inwardly may be anointed with the Holy Ghost, who is the spirit of all strength, comfort, relief and gladness. And vouchsafe for his great mercy (if it be his blessed will) to restore unto thee thy bodily health and strength to serve him; and send thee release of all thy pains, troubles, and diseases, both in body and mind. And howsoever his goodness, (by his Divine and unsearchable Providence) shall dispose of thee; we his unworthy ministers and servants, humbly beseech the eternal Majesty to do with thee according to the multitude of his innumerable mercies, and to pardon thee all thy sins and offences, committed by all thy bodily senses, passions and carnal affections; who also vouchsafe mercifully to grant unto thee ghostly strength by his holy spirit, to withstand and overcome all temptations and assaults of thine adversary, that in no wise he prevail against thee, but that thou mayest have perfect victory and triumph against the devil, sin and death: through Christ our Lord, who by his death hath overcome the prince of death, and with the Father and the Holy Ghost, evermore liveth and reigneth, God, world without end. Amen.

"Then follows the *Psalm* [33] xiii. How long wilt thou forget me, O Lord, and so forth. Glory be to the Father, and so forth. As it was in beginning," and so forth. [34]

Bucer however, struck out the rubric and prayer, omitting the oil he only retained the Psalm: leaving its use also a matter of discretion.

Si videtur commodum, dicatur etiam hic Psalmus, pro usitata, ante haec tempora, unctione. Usequequo Domine, and so forth. [35]

The ceremony of anointing was then used in the time of Edward vi, in the Protestant Church of England, and the prayer expressed exactly and fully those effects which the Roman Catholic Church teaches to be those of extreme unction: it is in perfect conformity to the direction of the Apostles and the usage of the holy Catholic Church in the East and in the West: it was cast out by Bucer, omitted by Elizabeth, and declaimed against by White and the holy alliance. Bucer (*Censur*, page 486,) quoted by L'Estrange, page 299, says, "It is clear, this rite is neither ancient, nor commanded to the Churches practice, by any either precept of God, or example of the primitive Fathers," and upon those grounds he calls for its rejection, yet L'Estrange confesses, that it is Apostolical, and therefore ancient, and matter of a precept given in St. James, of course, a precept of God, if the Epistle be the word of God. As to the example of the primitive Fathers, we have the testi-

[33] In the Catholic enumeration, *Ps.* xii.
[34] K. Edw. VI. *First Book. Ord.* Vis. Sick.
[35] Ed. Lat. Buceri.

mony of Pope Innocent I, who succeeded to the Chair of Peter in the year 402, who in his epistle to Decentius, c. viii, mentions it amongst those sacraments instituted by Christ, derived from the Apostles and always administered in the Church. St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and St. John Chrysostom, who lived at this period, make honorable mention of Innocent, as a holy, learned, and extremely well informed pontiff. The centuriators of Magdeburg, who were staunch Lutherans, acknowledge that the administration of the rite was customary in this age, (cap. vi. *De Rit. Visit. Infirm.*) In the sixty-ninth canon of the Arabic copy of the Canons of Nice, the oil for the anointing of the sick, is mentioned together with the oil of catechumens and the chrism.

White's passage regarding ordination, may go for what it is worth. He and several of the holy alliance will at all events allow that it is a visible ceremony instituted by Christ, to be permanent in his Church, and that the person who is ordained with becoming dispositions will undoubtedly at the time of ordination receive the grace or gifts of the Holy Ghost to enable him to discharge the important duties of the ministry, and this is all that the Roman Catholic Church requires to make it a sacrament. Whether it imprints an indelible character is another question. The British Parliament which is the general council of the English Protestant Church, decided in the case of Horne Tooke, that it does. In the time of Edward VI, the teaching was otherwise: but I believe the doctrine of Bishop Kemp's Church is that the character of orders is indelible. I profess my ignorance of the doctrine of his associates of other Churches regarding this subject. White and Bishop Kemp then at least ought not to quarrel with us upon the score of ordination, for they value what they have got of it, just as highly as we do.

With respect to matrimony, it is true that we raise it to an higher dignity than our opponents do, and yet the good gentlemen cannot be restrained from applying us to the text in which St. Paul condemns the Encratites, the Marcionites, the Ebionites, and their successors the Manicheans, who forbad marriage as criminal, and would never touch particular meats or wine, which came from the devil, as they say. But suppose we erred in believing that our blessed Redeemer did exalt this most necessary and important of all human contracts to the high dignity of a sacrament, and that since many religious duties are intimately connected therewith, it ought on those two accounts be in a great measure subject to the superintendence of the Church, we are at least consistent with our principle: nevertheless we do not deny the right which the State governments have, in all parts of the world, to make by reason of its being the "source and bond of civil society," such regula-

tions as they might see necessary, provided they be not inconsistent with the divine law in respect to this momentous concern. Upon our principles, we can very consistently explain why a clergyman is called upon for the celebration of marriage. But if it be only a civil contract; and the clergy have no concern in civil contracts; upon what principle will any gentleman of the holy alliance in the United States, who holds no civil commission, and in whom the State recognizes no civil authority, presume to be the principal official personage, and pocket fees for doing a civil duty? The general impression in the United States is that the clergy have no civil character beyond that of mere private citizens, but it seems this is an error: for a clergyman is an official personage, who receives a considerable sum for regulating mere civil contracts. The Roman Catholic Clergy do not pretend to be civil officers, they merely attend to the administration of the sacraments of their Church, and receive gratuities for discharging their duty as clergymen.

White continues, page 90.

"There still remain three exclusive offsprings of tradition, explained and defined by infallibility, which yield to none in happy consequences to the Roman Church—indulgences, purgatory, and the worship of saints, relics, and images.

"The wealth which has flowed into the lap of Rome, in exchange for indulgences, is incalculable. Even in the decline of her influence, she still looks for a considerable part of her revenues from this source: to which she also owes the degree of subjection in which she keeps the Roman Catholic governments. My unfortunate native country shows the nature and extent of this influence in a striking light."

He then continues upon the subject of indulgences to the 94th page. As this subject has been amply treated of in a former volume of the *Miscellany*, and every topic which White introduces has been there fully discussed, and all his positions disproved in those papers, I shall only refer you to the examination of an article which appeared in the *North American Review*, No. XLIV, for July, 1824, the remarks upon which are found in No. 69 of the *Miscellany*, Sept. 22, 1824, and the subsequent papers. After having read this examination, it will be manifest that Rome derives no part of her revenues from indulgences. His statement in page 93, that "the tax thus levied on the people of Spain, is divided between the King and the Pope," is a plain simple untruth, just as correct as the table given in Guthrie's *Geography* of the rate at which Rome sells leave to commit the sins there enumerated. But why should White have the hardihood to complain of the inability

of the Spanish Cortes to reduce tythes one half, whilst he had full in and connexion of her peculiar doctrines, have happened. The power which he was writing to support, the power which grinds down the Irish Catholic peasant with tythes and taxes to support a Protestant Church. The Spanish people and not the Pope resisted the encroachment of the Cortes. The Spanish peasant is supported by the charity of the Catholic Church, the Irish peasant is beggared and maddened by the rapacity of the Protestant Church; the Spanish peasants and poor desire to prevent the impoverishment of their Church by infidels who desired to enrich themselves, because the poor know that the Church property is shared with them, whilst a great portion of the Cortes having imbibed French infidelity, and having leagued with the infidels of the rest of Europe, imitated France in their efforts to destroy religion, and having disgusted a Catholic people, they made liberty and irreligion synonymous; and inflicted a deadly blow upon public freedom. White misrepresents the political state of Spain as much as he does the tenets of our Church: but my object being only to vindicate the latter, I shall not enter farther into Spanish politics. I shall therefore pass forward to his portion on Purgatory.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XXXIX.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 27, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I stated in my last letter that the next portion of White's book which I would examine, was that regarding Purgatory. It is the following, and is found in pages 94, 95:

"The belief in Purgatory is so inseparable from the former tenet, that I need not enlarge on the peculiar advantages which Rome has derived from it. I will not observe how fortunately for the interests of the Church of Rome, not only the existence, but even the mutual help and connexion of her peculiar dectrines, have happened. The power of remitting canonical penance would have been useless, on the cessation of penitential discipline; but tradition, having about the same time brought Purgatory to light, offered an ample scope to the power of the Roman keys. Transubstantiation now presented the means of repeating the sacrifice of the cross for those who were supposed to be undergoing the purification by fire. The whole system, indeed, is surprisingly linked together, and the very connexion of its parts, tending to secure the influence and power of the source from whence it flows, gives

it the appearance of an original invention, enlarged from the gradual suggestions of previous advantages.''

The former tenet to which he refers is that respecting indulgences. The passage now before us is one which it is not easy to refute, because it asserts so little, and it assumes so much: some of its assertions also are perfectly true, though the conclusions for whose insinuation they are constructed are false. Thus, when he asserts that the harmony of our doctrinal system is striking, he states only an obvious fact. It is one of the great characteristics of truth to be perfectly consistent in all its parts, as it is of error to exhibit multifarious inconsistencies. Surely our blessed Saviour did not reveal to the world a system of contradictions as the truth which descended from heaven, nor were his institutions either at their origin, or to become at any future period, inconsistent with his doctrines. As there was but one God, so there could be but one code of his true doctrine; and to say the least, the very exact accordance of principles and practices, of doctrines and institutions in a Church professing to be that of Christ the God of truth, must create a strong presumption in favor of her claim. ''Not so,'' however, says White, ''The whole system is, indeed, surprisingly linked together, and the very connexion of its parts, tending to secure the influence and power of the source from whence it flows, gives it the appearance of an original invention, enlarged from the gradual suggestions of previous advantages.'' Mark the dilemma which would arise from the admission of White's principle. ''If Catholics are at variance with each other in their doctrines, or if their doctrines and institutions are discordant, they cannot be professors of the true faith, because the true faith is consistent and not contradictory; if their professions and practice agree, and they exhibit unity of faith and consistency of practice, their system must be an invention of their own, gradually suggested, and not the doctrine of Christ.'' Thus in no case will White allow any Christian Church to have the doctrine of Christ; because, if there existed inconsistencies, her doctrine cannot be truth; and if there be none, it must be an invention. Such is the miserable retreat to which he is driven. It is indeed an unenviable position.

Now, we adduce on our own part the fact of our unity of faith and consistency of practice, as a strong and striking presumption, that our doctrine has been given to us by a God of truth, not invented by ourselves; and that our practice is consistent with his law. We say our conclusion is, upon this ground, more philosophical than his.

His next insinuation is, that our system must have been a gradually suggested invention, ''because it tends to secure the influence and power

of its source." What is its source? We say God is its source. Is it then an evidence of its falsehood, that our religious system tends to secure the influence and power of God—of our Saviour? No; he says that our system is not derived from God, but invented by ourselves; and he says that the doctrine of Purgatory is one of our inventions. Let us examine the charge to see its nature, and the facts to see its grounds. "Tradition brought Purgatory to light about the time that penitential discipline ceased." This proposition does not charge that the doctrine of Purgatory is an invention in that sense which would render it untrue, that it was a doctrine of Christ; most of White's fallacy consists in the studied ambiguity of his phrases, of which this is a notable example. When we say that any thing is brought to light, we usually mean that what is thus brought to light previously existed, though not manifestly and generally exhibited, thus what is so brought out is not an invention of imposture, but a finding of fact. What is discovered by tradition is not an invention, for the first time, but is receiving the testimony of a long-existing fact, which had been perhaps nearly or altogether overlooked. Thus when White charges that tradition brought Purgatory to light, his charge does not assert, but it insinuates, that the doctrine was an invention of folly or of imposture added to the doctrine of Christ, and this insinuation alone would be profitable for his object, hence this is the meaning which I attach to his words, for this must be what he intended. We have now only to fix the time of this invention. Here, like all other opponents of our Church, and in almost all their charges, he is cautiously vague and indistinct; "the time of the cessation of penitential discipline" is a space spread over some two or three centuries, and "about the same time" will give two or three centuries more; here then is a space of about six hundred years, whose precise commencement or termination is not fixed, and we are told that this vague period was the era of the introduction of this doctrine. The penitential canons had their origin in the days of the Apostles, but were not arranged in their regular form of full perfection, before the middle of the third century; and at the close of the next century, public penance was abolished by Nectarius the Bishop of Constantinople, and by his successor, St. John Chrysostom; their example was followed pretty generally in the eastern portion of the Church, but it was not until the commencement of the eighth century that the penitential discipline became considerably relaxed in the west, and it had not altogether ceased in the tenth century; and it is about this period so vague and so undefined, that White informs us that the doctrine of Purgatory was introduced.

Let us now see what is the doctrine itself. All that we are required as Roman Catholics to believe upon the subject, consists in two propositions, viz.

1st. "That there is a Purgatory." 2d. "That the souls therein detained may be aided by the prayers and suffrages of the faithful." Upon the first of these propositions, a question naturally presents itself. "What is meant by Purgatory?" Confining myself strictly to what is of doctrine, I answer, that it is a place in which some souls suffer for a time before they can enter heaven; but where that place is, or what is the exact nature or duration of the suffering, or what is the exact amount of relief which is received from the suffrages of the faithful, are all topics of conjecture and of opinion, upon which no doctrine is delivered; there is, indeed, a very general belief, that the suffering is from the action of fire, but this is not an article of faith. The souls which are liable to this punishment are those, which, being reconciled to God through the merits of Christ, and thus saved from the punishment of hell, have been subsequently stained with the filth of minor offences, or venial sins, which his mercy does not deem worthy of hell, but his justice deems worthy of punishment: also, those souls which, being saved from perdition by repentance and mercy, yet like the ancient penitents, Moses, and David, and others, had a temporary punishment substituted for the eternal, and not having through life endured or expiated what divine justice thus imposed, are after death, subjected to the temporary endurance equivalent to what remains.

My object now is to show that the belief of the existence of Purgatory was openly professed in the Christian Church after, together with and before, the existence of the penitential discipline, upon the cessation of which, White says it was brought to light, or invented; and, therefore, that his assertion is untrue.

The Latin Church believed in its existence in the thirteenth century, as no one will question; and, although the general opinion then amongst the Greeks was, that the suffering was not by fire, but by the endurance of darkness, labor, and affliction: all those Greeks united with the Catholic Church, and the vast majority of those separated from it, believed as of faith, the two propositions which form the whole substance of our doctrine, and the existence amongst the eastern Christians of a few, who denied their truth, would as little tend to prove the rejection of the doctrine by the Greeks, as the existence of the Albigenses and Vaudois, in the west, would tend to prove that it was rejected by the Latins.

I shall now adduce a few passages from the works of eminent witnesses of the Christian faith, in several of the previous centuries, and it

will be manifest, from their testimony, that the doctrine of the Church, which in those centuries was conformable to that of those witnesses, was that of our propositions.

1. St. Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, in France, who died, aged 63 years, on the 20th of August, 1153, in his *Sermon on the Death of Humbert*, has the following passage:

"My brethren the irrevocable time flies rapidly away, and whilst you guard against a trifling endurance, you incur a much greater punishment. For be aware of this, that after this present life, those things which we shall have neglected here, will be repaid to us a hundred fold in the places of purgation; yea, even to the last farthing. I know what a hard thing it is for a dissolute man to undergo discipline, for a talkative man to endure silence, for one accustomed to roving to remain stationary, but it will be harder, much harder to endure future afflictions."

2. St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, in England, was born in Piedmont, in the year 1033, and died in 1109; in his *Commentaries* upon chapter iii of *I Corinthians*, he writes,

"For we are to believe that for certain lighter offences there is a purging fire before the resurrection of the bodies."

3. Cardinal Peter Damian, Bishop of Ostia, born at Ravenna, about the year 988, and died on the 22d of February, 1072; in his *Second Sermon* on St. Andrew, [writes],

"Do not deceive yourself because a lighter penance is imposed upon you, for a grievous fault, by a mild or a partial person, since what you shall have here omitted must be supplied in the purging fires, because the Most High demands worthy fruits of penance."

4. Venerable Bede, a Priest in the province of York, in England, born about the year 673, died in 735, on the the 26th of May: in his *Commentary* on *Psalm* xxxvii he has left the following passage—(Prat. Bib. *Psalm* xxxviii.)

"Some persons commit venial sins more or less grievous, and therefore it is necessary that they should be rebuked in wrath, that is in the fire of Purgatory; now they are so placed before the day of judgment, that whatsoever is unclean in them might be thereby burned away, and so at length, they might be found fit to be with those who are to be crowned on the right hand."

5. St. Isidore, Bishop of Seville, in Spain, succeeded to Leander, Bishop of that see, who died in the year 600: Isidore died in 636: in his chapter xviii of the first book *Of Divine Offices*, he writes,

"For when the Lord saith (*Matt.* xii) whosoever shall commit a

sin against the Holy Ghost it will not be forgiven to him neither in this world, nor in that which is to come, he demonstrates that sins are to be forgiven to some persons, and to be purged away by some fire of purgation."

6. St. Gregory, the Great, was born at Rome, about the year 540, and in 574 was made prætor of the city by the Emperor Justin the younger: the subsequent year he became a monk, and about five years after he was sent by Pope Pelagius II as nuncio to Constantinople; he was recalled in 584, and in 590, upon the death of Pelagius, was advanced to the papacy. He had the faith established in England, and died on the 12th of March, 604. In his *Dialogues*, Book iv, chapter 39, we read,

"It is to be believed that there is a purgatory fire for some lesser faults before the final judgment."

And in his Comment on the third penitential Psalm, (*Psalm* xxxvii) he writes,

"I know that after the termination of this life, it will happen that some persons will make expiation in purging fires, others will undergo the sentence of eternal condemnation."

7. Boetius, the learned, the good, the honored and the afflicted, master of the palace and Secretary of State to Theodoric, was born in Rome in 470; deeply versed in science, and anxious for the promotion of learning, besides his own discoveries, he gave to the world his translations from the Greek of Euclid, of Plato, of Strabo, of Archimedes, and other authors of the ancient school. He was also a zealous defender of the purity of faith, with whose doctrines he was intimately acquainted. He was put to death by an unjust order of the barbarian to whom he was endeavoring to teach the art of ruling with Christian justice and moderation: he died on the 23d of October, 585, at a castle, about midway between Pavia and Rome. In his *Works*, Book iv, Prosa 4, is the following passage—

"Do you leave no punishment of souls after the death of the body? Yes, indeed, and very grievous, some of which I look upon as having the bitterness of punishment, but others are inflicted with a clemency of purgation."

8. Theodoret was born near the close of the fourth century in Syria, and having received a most extensive and liberal education, he bestowed his property in alms and entered a monastery near Apamea, now Hems, not far from Aleppo. In 423, he was at an unusually early period of life consecrated Bishop of Cyrus, a small and poor town about eighty miles from Antioch and one hundred and twenty from

Apamea: he died in 458: in his Greek Scholia upon chapter iii, of *I Corinthians,* is the following passage upon verse 13.

"We believe this to be that very fire of our purgatory in which the souls of the departed are proved and repurged as gold is in the crucible."

9. St. Augustin was born at Tagaste, in Numidia, on 13th of November, 354: he became a convert to a new life and to penance in August, 386, and was baptized by St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, on Easter eve in 387; he founded the institute of his hermits in 388, but did not found his institute of nuns until after he was raised to the episcopate; he was ordained priest in 390, consecrated Bishop in December, 395, and continued to administer the See of Hippo, from the death of Valerius in 396 to his own death in 430. He instituted the order of canons regular in the early part of his episcopate. No Bishop was better acquainted with the doctrines and practices of the Church than was Augustin, and few have left to her a larger legacy of valuable works. In his Book xxi, *Of the City of God,* chapter 16, making mention of baptized infants, he writes of one,

"Not only is he not prepared for eternal torments, but after death he undergoes no purgatorial affliction."

In the 24th chapter writing of faithful adults who die with lesser sins,

"It is plain, that their spirits being purged before the day of judgment by the temporal pain which they endure, will not be given over to the punishment of eternal fire."

In his Book v, Homily 16.

"They who have done things worthy of temporal pains, will pass through a certain purging fire, of which the apostle says: he will be saved, yet so as by fire."

In his Book ii, *de Genes.* against the Manichees, chapter 20.

"Whosoever will not till his field, but will allow it to be choked with weeds, hath in this life the malediction of the earth in all his works, and after this life will have either the fire of purgation, or eternal punishment."

There is a great number of similar passages upon the same subject in his works and those of the other authors whom I have quoted, and of several whom I have omitted. In his Book xxi *Of the City of God,* chapter 26, and in his Enchiridion, this father states that a question may be raised as to whether the punishment in Purgatory is by material fire, and if so, whether by the same sort of fire as that of which mention is made in *Matt.* xxv, "eternal fire." This is the distinction to which I

before alluded, and this question does not involve that of the existence of a purgatory, but regards a topic in which faith is by no means involved, viz. the nature of the punishment.

10. St. Jerom, the most learned commentator of the holy Scriptures, was born at Stridonium, now Sdrigni, near the famous Aquileia, about the year 330. Few, if any of the fathers of the Church had such ample opportunities of knowledge or turned them to better account: he died on the 30th of September 420. Amongst other testimonies of his, is the following from the latter portion of his *Commentary upon Isaias*:

"As we believe that the torments of the devil, and of all those who deny the truth, and of the impious who say in their hearts there is no God, as well as of other impious sinners are eternal; so we believe that there is a moderate sentence of the judge tempered with clemency for those Christians whose works are to be tried by fire and purged."

11. St. Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, was a pious and learned prelate, who died in the year 400; his see was in Cappadocia, near the lesser Armenia; he was one of the fathers of the second general council, (1, of Constantinople) in the year 381; and is an undoubted witness for the faith of his day. In his *Sermon for the Dead*, are to be found the following passages:

"1. Either being purged in the present life by prayers and the practice of wisdom, or expiated after death by the furnace of a purging fire, if he desires to return to his first happiness.

"2. Having gone forth from the body, he cannot become a partaker with the divinity, unless the fire of purgatory shall have taken away the spots fastened in the soul.

"3. Others clearing away the stains of matter, after this life by purging fire."

12. St. Ambrose, the renewned Bishop of Milan, was born about the year 340, in Gaul, where his father was prefect of the Pretorium; he was educated in Rome, whither his mother returned after his father's death, with the infant Ambrose, of whose education she took the most special care. In 368, Anisius Probus, whom Valentinian made prætorian prefect of Italy, appointed Ambrose his assessor, and subsequently governor of Liguria and Aemilia: in 374, at the unanimous request of the people, this governor was appointed Bishop of Milan, and consecrated on the 7th of December: his administration exhibits several most instructive lessons: and the prelate was conspicuous for learning, eloquence, zeal, disinterestedness, independence and piety: he died on April 4, in the year 397. I shall make but one quotation from his

works: in his *Comment* on *Psalm* xxxvi, (Prot. Vers. xxxvii,) verse 14, he has the following passage:

"Though the Lord shall save his servants, we shall be saved by faith; we shall be saved, yet so as by fire. Though we may not be burned utterly, we shall be burned. Yet how some shall remain in fire, and others only pass through fire, the divine Scripture teaches us in another place: for the people of Egypt was drowned in the Red Sea, but the Hebrew people passed through; Moses passed through, but Pharao was overwhelmed therein; because his grievous sins sunk him down: so will the sacrilegious be precipitated in the lake of burning fire."

13. St. Basil, Archbishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, was born in the year 329, of parents illustrious for their descent and station, as well as their sanctity; his education was equally attended to for learning and for virtue; and his labors, erudition, knowledge and sanctity, conspire to make him one of the brightest ornaments of the Church; he died on the 1st of January, 379. In his 9th chapter on *Isaias*, we have the following paragraphs:

"I. If therefore by confession we shall have uncovered the sin, we have thus dried upon the growing grass, such indeed as would have been fit to be fed upon and devoured by the purging fire.

"2. He doth not in this place indeed threaten perfect death and extermination, but he alludes to that purgation according to the statement of the Apostle, he shall be saved yet so as by fire."

14. Eusebius, Bishop of Emissa, or Apamea, now Hems, the birth place of Heliogabalus, about 30 miles from Aleppo in Syria, upon the Orontes, flourished about the year 340. The Homilies attributed to him are those of writers of not a later date; they are generally supposed to be of some of the Gallican prelates: but whoever might have been the writers, their doctrine is in perfect accordance with that of the Church in the fourth century. In Homily 3, *On the Epiphany* we read,

"This punishment of hell awaits those who having lost or not preserved baptism will perish eternally; but they who shall have done things worthy of temporary punishment will pass through a fiery flood, through shallows dreadful with burning globes."

15. St. Hilary, Bishop of Poictiers in Gaul, was styled by St. Augustin, the illustrious doctor of the Churches, and by St. Jerom, a most eloquent man, the trumpet of the Latins against the Arians: he was banished by the ageney of Julian the apostate, in the reign of Constantius, in 356; after spending some years in the East he was permitted to return in 360; and died at Poictiers in the year 368. In his *Comment* on *Psalm* cxviii, is the following passage:

"We must pass through that untiring fire, in which are to be endured those heavy punishments of a soul undergoing expiation for sins."

16. St. Cyprian, the eminent Bishop of Carthage, who suffered martyrdom in the year 258, left some valuable testimonies of the faith. In his Book iv, Epistle 2, we find the following passage,

"It is one thing for a person tormented because of sins to be purged during a long period and to be corrected during a considerable time by fire; a different thing is it to have purged away all his sins by suffering martyrdom."

17. Origen, the famous teacher of the Catechetical school of Alexandria, flourished in the year 250. Amongst other passages, he has left us the following in his 6th Homily on *Exodus*,

"He that shall be saved, shall be saved by fire, as if there was in him any thing of lead commingled, the fire would produce its effect thereupon and resolve it, so that he might all become pure gold."

18. Tertullian, that most ancient witness, born in the year 160, and died in 245, has left us amongst other passages the following in the xxxv chapter of his *Book of the Soul.*

"He will commit you to the lower prison, whence you will not be let go, unless by the delay of your resurrection, and every lesser crime being expiated."

In the same book, chapter lviii, is the following:

"Seeing then, we understand that prison which the gospel demonstrates to be places below, and the last farthing we interpret every small fault to be there punished by the delay of resurrection, no man will doubt but the soul doth expiate something in the places below."

I am aware that to several persons my letters are tedious, and are looked upon as too long, and not very interesting, but the subjects are matters of importance, and I write not so much to amuse my readers, as to instruct them: hence I am more anxious to produce a full conviction of truth than to please the fancy. I have here adduced a number of witnesses, selected from a far greater body, and considerably curtailed their testimony: but I believe I have upset White's position, that purgatory was only invented after, or about the decline of the penitential discipline, for I have shown that discipline not fully abolished in the tenth century, although about the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth, its decline commenced in Constantinople—and I have shown the doctrine of the existence of purgatory, to have been in the Church up to the middle of the second age: I shall afterwards show it to have a much higher and more remote antiquity. Indeed if White believed as

some of the best, and wisest, and most learned of the English Protestant clergy did upon this point, he never would have written the wretched passage which we now consider.

I shall here close this letter, and in my next I shall adduce evidence to prove the perpetual usage of praying for the dead, after which I shall lay before you the Scriptural proofs, and other historical and rational motives, to establish this conclusion, that it is one of the most ancient and universal doctrines of true religion, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are aided by the suffrages of the faithful.—Meantime I remain,

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XL.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 3, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—Before I proceed to adduce evidence of the fact, that prayers were offered up for the deceased brethren by the Christians, I shall premise that a purgatory might exist, and yet the souls therein detained not be aided by the prayers of their friends on earth: but when I shall have shewn that such prayers were offered, it is manifest the object must have been, the benefit of the dead, or the solace of the living, or both. In examining the evidence, therefore, you will observe what was the object of the prayer; what benefit was expected; did they who prayed seek alleviation for the dead, or only solace for themselves? If we shall find that they expected the first effect, it will tend much to support the conclusion at which I aim. It will be unnecessary for me to give the character and era of the witnesses already described; I shall therefore only explain the [character] of any additional persons whom I may introduce.

1. St. Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, was born in 1094, and died at the abbey of Clairvaux, in France, on the morning of November 2d, 1148, being the solemnity of "All Souls," as is still observed. His life was written by St. Bernard, and he informs us that the holy sacrifice was offered for him (chap. xxxi) and that Malachy, upon coming to the monastery, informed the community that he came there to die.

"You all know well the near approach of that day which I have always desired should be that of my dissolution. I know in whom I have placed my trust, and I shall not be defrauded of my desire, for I already have a portion accomplished. He who by his mercy hath

brought me to this place which I have desired, will not refuse the termination which I have also sought. As regards this worthless body, this is its place of rest: as regards my soul, God, who saveth those who trust in him, will provide; nor is it a small hope which is laid up for me respecting that day, upon which so many benefits are conferred by the living upon the dead."

Such was the doctrine that had prevailed in the Irish Church respecting the prayers for the dead, upon the great solemnity of "All Souls," and in this doctrine we shall see that she agreed with all other portions of the universal body of the faithful. In chapter xxx, St. Bernard relates the foundation of the knowledge which the monks of Clairvaux had of his desire to die upon the solemnity of "All Souls." When Malachy had been on a former occasion at the monastery,

"Being asked, at one time, in what place, if he had the choice, he should wish to die, for the brethren were conversing upon the subject, as to the choice of each; he hesitated, but being pressed, 'If I go hence,' said he, 'there is no place that I would prefer to that whence I may in the resurrection arise with our Apostle,' he meant St. Patrick. 'But if I were from home, and God so permitted it, I have chosen Clairvaux.' Being asked concerning the time, he said 'the solemnity of All Souls.' "

In another part of the work we have the account of his offering up the holy sacrifice of the mass, for the repose of the soul of his sister.

2. The venerable Peter, Abbot of Cluni, wrote a book in defence of the doctrine of prayer for the relief of the dead, against the Petrobrusians, or disciples of Peter de Bruis, who denied that it was useful to them.

3. St. Bernard, in his 66th Sermon on the Canticles, charges the Petrobrusians with error in denying the utility of such prayer.

4. The learned commentator Theophylact, who flourished toward the close of the eleventh century, has several passages which bear upon the subject; I shall produce only one, from his *Comment* on *Luke* xii.

"I say this respecting the oblation and alms which are made for the deceased, and which avail not a little even for those who have died under serious offences."

This as most of the other testimonies which I produce, regards a public and well known practice of the Church; not the opinion of an individual.

5. St. John Damascen, was son of a noble Christian, who was secretary to the Saracen Caliph towards the close of the seventh century: Ali the founder of the Persian Mohammedanism, appointed John to be governor of Dasmascus, and after the death of Ali, when the chief

power passed to Moawyah, the first dynast of the Omniad race, John, though a Christian, stood high in his esteem. Having resigned his offices and honors, John withdrew to the monastery of the great Laura, of St. Sabas, near Jerusalem, and there gave himself up to the study and contemplation of the Christian doctrine; about the year 780 he died full of years and good works; being the first who reduced Christian theology to a systematic course, in his great work, *The Exposition of the Orthodox Faith.* In his book *Concerning Those Who Erred from the Faith,* he adduced the testimony of St. Denis, St. Athanasius, SS. Gregory of Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, and others, to prove that at all times, orthodox Christians prayed for the repose of the deceased.

6. St. Isidore, of Seville, in his *Book of Divine Offices,* chapter xvii, has the following passage:

"Unless the Catholic Church believed that sins were forgiven to the faithful departed, she would not offer alms for their spirits, nor offer sacrifice for them to God."

Thus he alludes to the two well known practices of alms and sacrifice, as well as prayer being offered for the benefit of departed souls.

7. St. Gregory the Great, Pope, in his ivth book of *Dialogues,* chapter lv, [has] the following passage:

"The offering of the salutary victim is usually of great aid to souls, even after death, so that the souls of the departed appear even sometimes to demand it."

The custom of burying the dead in or near the Churches, is peculiar to Christianity. We shall see earlier testimony upon which to account for its introduction; but so far as it goes we shall now use the testimony of this great and enlightened Pope:—the passage is found in his *Dialogues,* book iv, chapter 50.

"For those whom weighty sins do not oppress, it is useful for the dead if their bodies be interred at the Church, because their relations sometimes coming thither, recollect them, and then pour out prayers for them to the Lord."

Surely it is one of the finest traits of religion, that it thus unites generations, linking in a bond of affection the living and the dead, and presenting the great bulk of mankind before the heavenly tribunal, as mutual suppliants for mercy for each other. Indeed it is a holy and an endearing communion.

8. Theodoret relates in chapter 26, book iv, of his *History,* that when the relics of St. John Chrysostom, were borne to Constantinople in the year 434, by St. Proclus; the emperor Theodosius and his sister Pulcheria accompanied them, and they both besought God for the pardon

and benefit of the souls of their deceased parents Arcadius and Eudoxia; this is related not as an extraordinary occurrence, but as one in the usual and well known order of things.

9. St. Paulinus, of Nola, was born in Bourdeaux, in Gaul, in the year 353; his father being prætorian prefect of that province, and at one time first magistrate of the western empire; his talents were of the first order, his masters of the most select description; the famous Ausonius was his teacher of rhetoric and poetry, and his acquirements were of the most extensive range: he was consul before the twenty-fifth year of his age. About the year 390, he and his wife having determined upon leading lives of retirement, he sold his vast possessions, the produce of which he bestowed in alms, and having resigned his seat in the Senate, and his other offices, entered a monastery: he was soon afterwards ordained priest, at the request of the people of Barcelona, in 393. His great devotion towards St. Felix, led him to a little sequestered spot in Italy, near the tomb of this holy priest, his desire being to serve in the most humble capacity, to decorate his soul with virtues, as it was enriched with learning. In the year 409, he was called from his retreat to fill the see of Nola: he died in the year 431. A virtuous lady named Flora having buried her son Cynægius in the Church of St. Felix, asked Paulinus what benefit was derived therefrom, and at the request of Paulinus, Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo, as an explanation, wrote his book *De Cura Mortuorum*, "Of the Care of the Deceased." Writing to Pammachus after the death of his wife, he comforts him with the assurance that he had satisfied her body with the tears which he shed, and her soul with alms which he bestowed on her account. In his Epistle V to the Bishop Delphinus, concerning the death of his own brother, he recommends his soul to his prayers, and amongst others, has the following passage:

"Obtain by your prayers pardon for him, and that a drop flowing from the least finger of your holiness might sprinkle his soul with refreshment."

Writing upon the same subject in his first letter to Amandus, he has the following:

"Wherefore we earnestly entreat you as a brother to unite in our labors of prayer: that the merciful God would vouchsafe to refresh his soul with drops of compassion by your prayers."

10. St. Augustine has so much upon the subject that the difficulty consists not in the discovery but in the selection. In his book *Of the Care of the Departed*, the occasion of which I have just shown, we have the following passage, chapter 1:

"We read in the book of the Macchabees, that sacrifice was offered for the dead; but, if this never had been read in the old Scriptures, the authority of the universal Church, which upon this subject is glaringly evident, is not small; where in the prayers of the priest which are poured out at the high altar to the Lord our God, their commendation of the departed has its proper place."

In this passage we have from St. Augustine evidence that the custom was glaring, general and authoritative, and that in the liturgy there was a proper place for such prayers. The next passage not only shows the doctrine of the Church in this day to be that those prayers of the faithful on earth were useful, but that the faithful also besought the saints in heaven to pray for their deceased friends, and that this was an additional benefit: it is found in chapter 4, of the same book.

"When, therefore, the mind recollects where the body of its beloved friend is interred, and there is brought to the memory the place venerable by the name of the martyr, the affection of the person who recollects and prays commends the beloved soul to the same martyr; which custom, when adhered to by the faithful, is, beyond doubt, most beneficial to the departed."

The following beautiful passage from the same chapter is not only a clear testimony of the doctrine and custom of the Church at that period, but moreover exhibits the charitable affection of the Church, and the excellence of the communion of saints.

"We must not pass over the supplications for the souls of the departed, which the Church regulates to be made in a general commemoration for all those who die in the Christian and Catholic society, even though she does not mention all the names; that their one pious, common mother, the Church, might for this end supply the deficiency for those who left no parents, or children, or relations, or friends."

The same doctrine is found in an hundred other places of his works, and in his book *Of Heresies*, he mentions that the heresy of Aerius consisted in denying the utility and propriety of offering sacrifice for the dead.

11. St. John Chrysostom was born at Antioch, about the year 344; his father Secundus, was the master of the horse, or commander in chief of the imperial troops at Syria, his mother was left at the age of twenty a widow, with ample means, and a daughter and son, for whom she provided the best teachers. John's master of eloquence was the famous Libanius, who declared this pupil of his to be a treasure to the empire: in the study of philosophy under Andragatius he made astonishing progress: in early youth he paid great attention to the truths

of religion; at the age of twenty, he pleaded for some time at the bar; the first dignities of the empire lay open before him; but upon mature reflection he embraced a life of retirement; he was ordained deacon by St. Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, in the year 381, and priest by Flavian, the successor of this holy bishop in 386: twelve years afterwards, he was raised to the see of Constantinople: and after a variety of trials and persecutions, he died a prisoner and exile in Cappadocia on the 14th of September, 407. The extraordinary eloquence with which he was gifted, caused him to receive the appellation of Chrysostom or Golden mouth, and his erudition and virtue were conspicious. In his 41st Homily on the *First Epistle of the Corinthians*, we find the following passages.

"1. The deceased is aided not by tears, but by prayers, by supplications, and by alms deeds.

"2. Let us not be weary of giving to the departed by offering up prayers for them."

Those passages from amongst several others clearly exhibit his doctrine, which was that of the whole Church that was in his communion. The next extract from the 69th of his homilies to the people of Antioch shows not only that it was his doctrine and that of the Church, but that moreover it was a doctrine delivered by the Apostles, or else we must say that neither he nor his auditors knew what was the history of their doctrine in the three centuries that intervened.

"Those things were not rashly enacted by the Apostles, that in the tremendous mysteries there should be commemorations made of the departed; for they knew that great profit arises to them therefrom. A mighty benefit."

12. St. Jerome testifies the doctrine in many places; amongst others, in his *Epistle to Pammachus*, on the death of his wife Paulina.

"Other husbands scatter violets, roses, lilies, and purple flowers on the tombs of their consorts, our Pammachus moistens the holy remains, the venerated bones, with the balsam of alms; he cherishes the resting ashes with those ointments and odors, knowing that it is written, as water extinguishes life, so do alms deeds sin."

13. St. Epiphanius was born about the year 310, at Eleutheropolis, a city of Judea: he was master of the Hebrew, Greek, Egyptian, Syrian and Latin languages, and very intimate with St. Hilarion, and other eminent anchorets and holy men. Having spent some time in retirement in Egypt, he returned to Palestine and built a monastery in the year 333, and devoted himself with great assiduity to prayer and study. He was looked upon as the oracle of religious information in

Palestine; in the year 367 he was chosen Bishop of Salamis, or Constantia, in the island of Cyprus, and was intimate with most of the great men who decorated the Church during the latter period of his life; he died on his way from Constantinople to Salamis, in the year 403. Amongst his works is one on heresies, in which he enumerates twenty before Christ, and eighty in the first four centuries of Christianity: the seventy-fifth of which is that of Aerius who denied the utility and efficacy of prayer for the dead, and the utility and efficacy of which Epiphanius mentions as doctrines of the Church of Christ.

14. St. Ambrose in his Book ii, epistle 8, to Faustinus, concerning the death of his sister:

"Wherefore, I think, that she is not so much to be wept for, as followed by prayers, nor is her soul to be made sorrowful by your tears, but rather recommended to God by oblations."

In his orations on the death of Theodosius, of Valentinian, and of his brother Satyrus, he prays for the repose of their souls, and promises that he will offer the sacrifice for this object.

15. St. Gregory, Nazianzen, was born at Arianzum, an obscure village in the territory of Nazianzum, a station or town of Cappadocia, of which his father was made bishop about the year 330, when Gregory was about five or six years of age: at a proper age, Gregory, after having learned in the schools of Cappadocia, went to Cæsarea, in Palestine, where existed a famous school of eloquence, thence to Alexandria, in Egypt, and subsequently to Athens, to become perfect in his studies. During this period, he became intimate with St. Basil, and in Athens they had Julian, the apostate, as a fellow student, in the year 55. Gregory at this time foretold his future misconduct, from his deportment. Leaving Athens, he went to Constantinople, where he met his brother Cæsarius, who had studied medicine, and was become chief physician to the Emperor Constantius. Many efforts were used to induce Gregory to plead at the bar, or to teach rhetoric; but he had made up his mind for religious retirement, and returned to Nazianzum, where in religious solitude he continued to pray and study. In 361, he was ordained priest, and was consecrated Bishop of Sasima, by St. Basil, then Bishop of Cæsarea, in 372. He was never able to get possession of his see, owing to the opposition of Schismatics, and his peaceable disposition. In 378, he was [prevailed on] to accept the see of Constantinople, long harassed by heresy, schism and intrigue, [from which] after having endured great opposition, and many insults, and having done incalculable good to religion, he retired for the sake of peace. In 381, after his resignation, he withdrew to Nazianzum, and having procured the

consecration of Eulalias, for that see, he spent the remainder of his days in prayer and meditation, dying at a private retreat, near Nazianzum, in 389, or 391. Gregory is then an excellent witness of the doctrine of his day. In his oration on the death of his brother Cæsarius, he prays for the departed faithful, as well as for the living.

"Let us recommend to mercy, both our own souls, and those of the persons who being, as it were, more forward on their journey, have come before us to the resting place."

And in conclusion, he prays for the rest of his brother Cæsarius.

16. St. Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem, was born in or near that city in the year 315. No one of the ancients studied more closely the holy Scriptures, the previous Christian writers, and the pagan philosopers. He was ordained priest, by Maximus, Archbishop of Jerusalem, in 345, and was by him appointed catechist, to teach the doctrine to the catechumens, and preacher to expound it to the people—his *Catechetical Sermons* for the year 347 or 348, are preserved and are a most precious treasure—he succeeded Maximus in the episcopacy in the end of the year 350, and witnessed the disappointment of those who attempted to rebuild the Jewish Temple, thus to disprove the divinity of the Christian religion. After persecution and banishment from his see, he returned thereto in 361, and assisted at the second general council, 1st of Constantinople, in 381, and died in the year 386. The following are passages taken from his last *Catechesis.*

"1. We also pray for the deceased holy fathers, bishops, and in general all who are dead, believing that this will be a great succor to those souls for which prayer is offered, whilst the holy and tremendous victim lies present.

"2. If a king being offended at certain persons, banish them, and their friends offer a rich garland for them, will he not be moved to remit their punishment? In like manner we offering up prayers to God for the dead, though they be sinners, do not make a garland, but we offer Christ sacrificed for our sins, striving to propitiate and make our merciful God beneficent to them and to ourselves."

17. St. Basil compiled a liturgy still used in several Greek Churches, and which contains prayers for the commemoration of the dead, to obtain their repose.

18. Ephrem of Edessa, one of the most illustrious and learned teachers of the Syriac Church, was born in the district of Nisibis, in Mygdonia, a division of Mesopotamia, before the year 290, his parents were poor but very industrious country people—he attained the age of eighteen years before he was baptized, and soon after his baptism

he retired to a monastery, in which he had hard labor, much prayer, and considerable study. About the year 340, he went to Edessa, and was ordained deacon of that Church. He was not deeply versed in philosophy of the schools, but was powerful in that given by nature: he had an excellent turn for poetry, and composed many pieces calculated to convey the truths of the Gospel, and the principles of morality to the mind of the hearer: he wrote his native language, Syriac, with facility and eleganee, was quite familiar with the holy Scriptures, and deeply learned in the doctrines of Christianity: he was also gifted with splendid eloquence. He made great numbers of converts; but never could be induced, because of humility, to receive the order of priesthood. He died about the year 878. His testament, or will commences,

"I, Ephrem die. Be it known unto you all, that I write this testament to intreat of you that you would assidously remember me in your prayers after my decease: for I have spent my life in vanity and in iniquity."

He particularly requests to have alms, oblations, (masses,) and prayers made on the thirtieth day from his decease.

19. St. Athanasius, the great Patriarch of Alexandria, was born about the year 296, and died on Thursday, May 2, in the year 373. This great luminary of the Church certainly was well acquainted with her doctrines. In his work, *ad Antioch*, ix, 34, he asks, whether departed souls benefit by the prayers of the living: to which he gives the answer that unquestionably they do.

20. Eusebius, Archbishop of Cæsarea, the historian; one of the most learned of the ancient prelates, died in 339, fifteen years after his appointment; in his fourth book *Of the Life of the Emperor Constantine*, he states that the Emperor desired to be buried in a splendid Church, that his soul might have the benefit of a multitude of prayers.

21. St. Cyprian, Book i, Epistle 9, has the following passage:

"The Bishop, our predecessors, enacted that no one dying should nominate any of the brotherhood of the clergy to be the executor or guardian of his effects, and that if any person would do so, there should be no offering made for him, nor sacrifice offered for his repose."

He farther on applies the principle of this statute to a special case.

"And therefore since Victor has dared to appoint Germinius Faustinus, a Priest, his executor, contrary to the law lately made by the Prelates in their council, no oblation can be made by you for his rest, nor any prayer on his behalf."

In this case we see that before the year 250, the refusal to offer

up prayers or mass for the repose of the departed, was considered to be a severe punishment.

22. Tertullian, in his book *Of the Soldier's Crown*, places amongst the traditions of the Apostles the suffrages and prayers for the dead: and in his book *On Monagamy*, is the following passage regarding the conduct of a Christian wife towards her deceased husband.

"Let her pray for him, and demand earnestly refreshment for his soul, and fellowship in the first or early resurrection: and let her have sacrifice offered on the anniversaries of his death, for if she do not this she has repudiated him as far as lies in her power."

In other places the same doctrine is to be found.

23. The ancient work attributed to St. Denis the Areopagite, *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, is by many and judicious writers attributed to this convert of St. Paul the Apostle, whilst a greater number of others equally if not more erudite, state that there is not sufficient proof of the assertion. But both parties are fully agreed that the work is most ancient and orthodox, and if not written in the first century, that it at all events contains the doctrine of that age. Chapter vii, part 3, has the following passage:

"The venerable Prelate then drawing near repeats the holy prayer over the dead person: in that prayer he beseeches the divine clemency to remit to the deceased all sins committed by human infirmity, and, that it might place him in light and in the region of those who live."

Those are the very expressions which the Church this day uses at interments, and which she preserves as those which the Apostles first used on similar occasions.

24. St. Clement was of Jewish extraction and converted to Christianity in the year 62, if not previously, as we find him in that year a companion and fellow sufferer of St. Paul at Philippi: he accompanied the Apostle to Rome, was consecrated Bishop of St. Peter, whom he survived, as he did also his two immediate successors, Linus and Cletus, when in the year 89 or 90, he succeeded to the Papacy, which he filled in the year 100. Many writings are attributed to him, with little foundation. But the liturgy is admitted by all good critics to be his; or if not, to be so ancient, and so authentic as to be a copy or imitation of what he used and appointed; and in this liturgy we find the description of a long prayer for the repose of the deceased.

I have thus adduced evidence to prove that it was the custom of the Catholic Church at all times to pray for the repose of the souls of

the faithful departed. In my next I shall adduce other evidence respecting the topics connected with the doctrine of Purgatory.

Yours, and so forth,

B. C.

LETTER XLI.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 24, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—In following up the evidence for the existence of a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, it might not be amiss to remind you that all which is necessary for me to prove, in order to refute White is, that the belief of this doctrine existed before the abandonment of the ancient discipline of canonical penances: and that period might be properly fixed about the close of the tenth century. I believe that I have more than done this; yet as I am upon the subject, permit me to go farther into its examination. I have laid before you the testimony of ecclesiastical writers. I shall now give you the testimony of public documents and monuments. The former will consist in the declarations of public bodies, the latter will be a collection of facts, customs, and memorials.

I shall not here adduce the declarations of the Councils of Trent, of Florence, and of Lateran, nor shall I enumerate more than a few of the earlier synods held in different places, from which it will be seen that ours was not a doctrine confined to a single nation or a few spots, but was that of the universal Church.

In the year 868, a National Council was held at Worms on the Rhine, then a suffragan see of Mayence, in which a question was raised as to the propriety of praying and offering mass for the repose of the souls of those persons who had been hanged upon the gallows, after conviction in a criminal court, and it was determined that they were equally entitled to the mercies of Christ as other sinners, and therefore not to be deprived of the ordinary aid of religion, and [that] they were to be prayed for after death.

In the year 813, the second provincial council of Chalons on the Saone, was held at the request of the Emperor Charlemagne: the thirty-ninth canon requires that in every mass that is celebrated, there should be prayers offered for the repose of the souls of the departed faithful. We shall see that special masses for their repose had been usual from the very origin of Christianity, but though the liturgies had desired this

commemoration of the dead in the holy sacrifice, still in several places neglect and omission had to be corrected by provincial councils.

Spelman gives us the following form of a prayer for the dead, found in the twenty-seventh canon of the Synod of Cloveshoo, in Kent, in 747:

"O Lord, we beseech thee, grant that the soul of such a person may be secured in a state of repose, and admitted with the rest of thy saints into the regions of light and bliss."

I could produce several others more full than this, but Rapin, who would, if he could, have made a different statement, adduces this to show the notoriety of the fact, that prayer for the dead was then common in the English Church, a testimony which White appears to have overlooked.

The first Council of Braga, in Portugal, then a part of Spain, was held in the year 563, on the first of May, under the reign of King Theodomirus: the Archbishop Lucretius presided: a number of canons were made against the Priscillianists, others for discipline.

The sixteenth canon prohibits the prayers of the Church to be offered for the repose of the souls of those guilty of suicide, forbids commemoration to be made of them in the mass, and commands that no funeral service shall be performed for them nor for criminals who shall have been executed pursuant to the law. The twenty-first canon regulates that the alms and offerings made by the faithful on behalf of the dead, shall be equally divided twice in the year amongst the clergy who are to pray for their repose.

Regulations regarding prayers for the dead are to be found in the canons of the second Council of Orleans, which assembled on the 23rd of June, 533, in which were twenty-six Bishops of the province of Lyons and Aquitain: its canons were but the renewal of more ancient laws.

The Council which is generally called the Fourth of Carthage, in Africa, was held in the consulship of Eutychianus and Honorius in the year 398, and gave the most full code of discipline which we find about that period. Amongst other regulations, its seventy-ninth canon enacts, that persons subjected to public penance, who having done, as far as they were able, the several works imposed, but who die at sea without having received the communion or having been formally reconciled, shall nevertheless have their share in the prayers and oblations for the faithful deceased, and commands that they shall be prayed for and commemorated after their decease.

Upon this document I shall only remark, that St. Augustin, Bishop of Hippo, was a member of this council, and that White's position, that it was upon "the cessation of penitential discipline, tradition

brought purgatory to light," is altogether destroyed by this single case, for it exhibits both as fully co-existing, long before the cessation or decline of the discipline. I can scarcely believe that Bishop Kemp and his associates are so little acquainted with canon law, as not to have known this enactment, and am therefore at a loss to know how they could have so little respect for their own characters, as scholars, as to have recommended White's book.

A council had been held in the same city in the previous year, during the consulship of Cæsarius and Atticus, 397, the twenty-ninth canon of which directs that mass shall not be celebrated by any but persons who are fasting, except on the Thursday before Easter, and to remedy a contrary abuse which had been creeping in, of priests celebrating the mass after having broken fast, to aid the souls of persons who had died that day, at a late hour; it directs that if prayers are to be offered in such a case for Bishops or any other of the faithful departed, in the afternoon, prayers only shall be offered, but not the sacrifice, on that day, nor by a person who has broken his fast.

In the Arabic copy of the acts of the Council of Nice, held in the year 325, the sixty-fifth canon directs that upon the demise of a Bishop, notice should be given of his death to all the Churches and Monasteries which were within his jurisdiction, that prayers might be offered for the repose of his soul.

St. Epiphanius, the learned Archbishop of Salamis, who lived from 310 to 403, in his famous work *On Heresies*, gives the seventy-fifth place to Aerius, the Constantinopolian monk, who, displeased and disappointed at the elevation of his friend Eustathius to the government of that see, through opposition denied the superiority of the order of Bishop to that of Priest, and appears also to have been the first who denied the efficacy of prayers for the dead: this heresiarch was a cotemporary of Epiphanius, and his doctrine was by all Christians declared to be a novelty, which contradicted that which had been received from the Apostles. St. Augustine gives it the fifty-third place in his catalogue of heresies. It soon became extinct, and so continued for some centuries, until the Waldenses revived it.

I come now to another series of documents; the liturgies of the early Church, in all of which we find prayers for the departed faithful, that they may be delivered from suffering and brought to the enjoyment of eternal glory. Surely Bishop Kemp will not venture to assert that the liturgies of St. James, of St. Basil, of St. Chrysostom, or of St. Ambrose, were not in existence before "the cessation of penitential discipline." I shall make a general remark, applicable to all the liturgies, before I come

to their special enumeration. In the first ages of the Church, it was not usual to have written copies of the liturgy, but the clergy learned from each other, and repeated from memory; the faithful also who were admitted cautiously to holy mysteries, were charged to be extremely careful not to speak of them before strangers, who were admitted only to the mass of the catechumens, and the sermon. The Church of England, after separating from the Catholic Church, by way of following the ancient practice, dismisses the congregation after morning prayer and sermon, and retains only those who are to receive during the communion service. Both in the early Greek and Latin Churches, the betraying of the mystery, or of the sacred books, was looked upon as equivalent to apostacy. Thus the liturgies were not written until towards the close of the fourth century, and the first complaint which we hear of any attempt to change them, is against Nestorius in the beginning of the fifth age. Previously to their separation, it is believed that the Apostles, who had during many years celebrated together, had agreed upon an outline or general form, from which there was to be no departure; and when, after several ages, the office was examined in the several places in which they had been, the general coincidence is perfect proof of a common origin and a faithful observance of the original institution.

The liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem is that which is generally known by the appellation of the liturgy of St. James, who was first Bishop of that see. St. Cyril, one of his successors, explaining its order to the neophytes in his *Catechetical Discourses*, in the year 349, says:

"We then pray for the holy Fathers, and Bishops, and lastly, for all those who have quitted this world in our communion, believing that their souls receive very great relief from the prayers which are offered for them in this holy and tremendous sacrifice which lies upon the altar."

The *Liturgy of St. James*, which, from the earliest period, has been used in the Church of Jerusalem, contains the following:

The Memento for the Dead: The deacon says: "Remember, O Lord, our God," and the priest bowing down says: "Remember, O Lord, our God, the souls of all those whom we have commemorated, and of such as we have not mentioned; remember those who have departed, in the true faith, from the time of the just Abel down to this day: make them rest in the land of the living, in thy kingdom, in the delights of paradise, in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, our holy fathers; where there is no sorrow, grief, nor lamentation, where the light of thy countenance beams on all sides and diffuses its brilliancy in every manner."

The fathers of the Council of Trullo, in Constantinople, in 692, quote this liturgy of St. James to refute the errors of the Armenians: in the ninth century, Charles the Bald, King of France, desired to see the mass celebrated according to this liturgy of that venerable Apostle. The *Agios O Theos* was first sung in Constantinople in 446, and this, together with an addition of Peter Fullo, the chief of the Theopaschites in 463, was joined to this formulary, [and] the circumstance of those additions has caused some hypercritics, who wished to destroy the evidence of doctrine contained in the document, to endeavor to show that no part of it could have come from St. James; the contrary, however, is now too fully proved. The Patriarchs of Constantinople have generally succeeded in procuring the substitution of the liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, even in many parts of Syria, for that of St. James.

The liturgy of St. John Chrysostom is so called rather from having been revised than compiled by him, and it has always been the principal one in use at Constantinople and the Churches which adhered to that See in its schism, as well as amongst the Catholic Greeks in Russia and Italy, [and] in the Turkish empire. It has a commemoration of the living and of the dead, whether the latter be saints in heaven or suffering in purgatory. They are blended together for the purpose, as Casibalas says, of exhibiting the perfect communion of all portions of the Church. Le Brun, the erudite and the indefatigable collector of liturgies, makes the same remark. Having so done, the office then separates each portion, praying for the living and for the suffering dead, and celebrating the memory and seeking the prayers of the saints in heaven.

The commemoration of the living and the dead. "We offer, moreover, this reasonable worship for those who are departed from us in the faith, our forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, chaste persons, and all others perfected in faith," with a loud voice: "especially for the most holy, immaculate, blessed above all, and most glorious Lady, the Mother of God, and ever Virgin Mary."

The choir sing the praises of the blessed Virgin: the deacon incenses the altar, takes the dyptics or registers, and makes a commemoration of the living and the dead.

The priest says in a low voice: "Saint John the Baptist, the prophet and precursor of our Redeemer, the holy and glorious Apostles, Saint N. whose memory we celebrate and all other saints, for the sake of whose prayers, grant us, O Lord, thy protection, and remember those who died in the hope of a resurrection to eternal life."

The priest prays for some living persons, in particular, and says: "for the health, and protection and remission of sins of N. the servant of God."

For the dead he says: "For the rest and deliverance of the soul of thy servant N. that it may rest in a place of light, where there is no sorrow nor mourning, but where it may rejoice, O Lord God, in the light of thy countenance."

The priest turns to the door, and blessing, with a loud voice, says: "may the mercy of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ, be with you all: the choir: and with thy spirit."

The deacon: "Celebrating the memory of all the Saints, let us again pray to the Lord, on account of the precious gifts now offered, that our merciful God, who hath received them on his heavenly and intellectual altar, may send down upon us his divine grace, the gift of the Holy Ghost;" the choir: "Lord have mercy on us," the priest says in a low voice, "that the heavenly gifts may draw down on us all spiritual graces, and turn not to our condemnation."

The *Liturgy of St. Basil* is a very ancient document, and in extensive use, particularly in the Egyptian and some Eastern Churches. The father, whose name it bears, died in 379, but he only regulated in a more definite form what had come down to him from the Apostles. The anaphora or canon of offering or oblation of this, is preserved by the Coptic Churches, together with the ancient prayers of the office used by St. Mark the Evangelist, who was the first Bishop of Alexandria; and indeed St. Basil's Anaphora does not differ much in form, and by no means in doctrine, from the ancient Alexandrian or Coptic, which is called that of St. Mark. I shall here give two extracts.

The first commendation of the dead: "Remember, also, O Lord, all those of the priestly order, and those of the laity, who have slept and are already at rest; vouchsafe, O Lord, to grant rest to their souls, in the bosom of holy Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; lead them into verdant pastures, upon the waters of refreshment, and to a paradise of delights, remote from grief of heart, sorrow and mourning, to the glorious light of thy Saints."

The deacon says the Dyptics [36] and recites the names of the dead. After the dyptics the priest says: "Grant, O Lord, that those, whose souls thou hast received, may rest in thy heavenly kingdom; but for us, who sojourn upon earth, preserve us in thy faith, and give us always thy peace." People: "As it was, and so forth." Priest: "Direct us

[36] Registers containing the names of the living and the dead; the names were written on tables called *dyptics,* because they folded in two.

to thy kingdom, that in this as well as in all other things, thy holy, glorious and blessed name may be hallowed, glorified, praised and sanctified, together with thy dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost."

In a subsequent commemoration of the living and the dead, is the following passage:

"Preserve the living by the angel of peace, and grant, O Lord, that the souls of the departed may rest in the bosom of our holy fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in a paradise of pleasure," and so forth.

The *Liturgy of St. Clement* though probably not written by him, was, if not received from him, conformable to his doctrine, and is a very old document. In this, after commemorating the Martyrs, prayers are offered up for those who have died in the faith.

The *Ambrosian Liturgy* was probably in use in the Church of Milan, long before the time of St. Ambrose who became Bishop in the middle of the fourth century, but having been probably revised by him it bears his name; in it is a long prayer for the repose of the faithful departed.

The *Roman Missal* which has been preserved with the greatest care, and whose canon is of high antiquity has the following:

"Be mindful also, O Lord, of thy servants, men and women, N. and N. who are gone before us with the sign of faith and rest in the sleep of peace." He joins his hands, and prays a little while for those departed, whom he intends to pray for; then stretching out his hands he proceeds: "to these, O Lord, and to all who sleep in Christ, grant we beseech thee, a place of refreshment, light and peace." He joins his hands and bows his head. "Through the same Christ, our Lord. Amen."

The *Mosarabic Liturgy*, is that which was used in Spain during a long period: its name is an abbreviation of Moorish and Arabic, which is explained by its history.

F. Le Brun has shown, that during the first four centuries the Roman order was followed in Spain; in the fifth the Goths took possession of that country. But the Goths, before they fell into Arianism, received from the East, and especially from Constantinople, the Christian faith, and consequently the *Greek Liturgy*. Martin, Archbishop of Braga; John, Bishop of Gironna; S. Leander, Archbishop of Seville; all of whom contributed to the conversion of the Goths about the close of the sixth century, were educated in the East. They were, therefore, induced to preserve the *Gothic Liturgy*, which came from that part, and which was conformable to the Gallican, followed in Narbonic Gaul, where the Goths ruled as well as in Spain.

Hence it follows, that S. Leander and S. Isidore of Seville, his brother, in drawing up the liturgy of Spain, did not alter the substance, which existed before them; they merely added some prayers, collects, and prefaces relating to the Gospels and to the different days of the year. But the sense of the prayers, the essential rites, the oblation, consecration, adoration of the Eucharist, the communion, and so forth, are the same. The consequences resulting from them are not different. The *Gothic Liturgy* was retained in Spain by the Christians, who maintained their independence, after the invasion of the Moors or Arabs, until the year 1080, and it is from the intermixture of the Christians with the Moors, that the former were called Mozarabes. The Popes were obliged to exert themselves for more than thirty years, in succession, to get the *Roman Liturgy* re-established in Spain.

The following is an extract from this old Spanish office:

"We offer thee, O Sovereign Father, this immaculate victim for thy holy Church, as the expiation for a prevaricating generation, for the purification of our souls, for the health of the infirm, for the indulgence and repose of the faithful departed, so that changing their abodes of sorrowful detention, they may enjoy the happy society of the just."

The Syrian Catholics retain the general features of the liturgy of St. James, but in place of that passage of it which we have before given, their office contains the following:

"We again make commemoration for all the departed who have died in the true faith, whether they have been members of the Church of this country, or from what other region soever they might have come before thee, our God, who art the Lord and master of all spirits and of all flesh. We pray, implore and supplicate the Christ our God, who hath received their souls, to make them by his mercy worthy of the pardon of their sins, and to bring them together with ourselves to his kingdom, and therefore we thrice say Kyrie eleison." The priest bows down, prays for the dead, and then elevating his voice. "O God, the Lord of all spirits, and of all flesh, remember those whom we commemorate, and who have departed from this world in the true faith: give repose to their souls—making them worthy of that happiness which is tasted in the bosom of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, where the light of thy countenance shineth, and whence are banished grief, pains and lamentation. Enter not into judgment with thy servants, for no man can be justified in thy sight; since there is no one of those who dwelt upon the earth free from all sin and stain, unless it be Jesus

Christ our Lord, thy only Son, through whom we hope for them and for ourselves mercy, and the remission of sins, through his merits."

When in the year 451 Eutyches was condemned in the Council of Chalcedon, he made many adherents in Syria and Egypt; vast numbers then separated themselves from the Catholic Church; and they who remained faithful were by the seceders called Melchites; from Melchi, the Hebrew and Syriac expression for a king or emperor, because they adhered to the imperial decree which commanded submission to the determination of the council. Previously to this they all used the same liturgy which they had received from what was to them even then remote antiquity. Since then the opposition between them is as great as that between the Catholics and any of the Protestant divisions of the west. Yet the heretical Syrians retain this same liturgy which is used by the Catholics, and testify that their fathers had it down from the apostolic days. So also do the Egyptians who are generally Eutychians, retain the liturgy of St. James, testifying that it came from Mark, James and Basil. In like manner the heretical Greeks subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople retain that of St. John Chrysostom and that of St. Basil, testifying to their great antiquity.

Thus we have full evidence of the high antiquity of those several public documents; and no evidence can better testify the religious belief of a people than their liturgy: I shall at present add but little more, though I might extend my remarks to considerable length. I shall give a few passages from the *Armenian Liturgy*:

"Remember, O Lord, and be merciful and propitious to the departed souls, and in particular to those for whom we offer this sacrifice."

Another Prayer. "We ask that mention might be made in this sacrifice of all the faithful in general, men and women, young and old, who have died with the faith in Christ Jesus." The Choir answers: "Remember then, O Lord, and have compassion upon them." The Priest: "Grant them repose, light, and a place amidst thy saints in thy heavenly kingdom, and make them worthy of thy mercy. Remember, O Lord, and have compassion on the soul of thy servant N. according to thy great mercy. Remember also, O Lord, those who are recommended to our prayers whether they be living or dead, grant to them true goods in return, goods which shall not be fleeting."

Thus we see the firm and uniform belief of the persons of all nations and of the earliest ages who used those liturgies to be, 1st. That there is a Purgatory; and 2d. That the souls therein detained, are helped by the prayers and suffrages of the faithful.

I leave to any person of ordinary observation to draw the inference, whence this doctrine came.—We see Aerius who attempts to deny the efficacy of such prayers immediately ranked amongst the heretics. We do not find him quote a single document or authority of the preceding three centuries to give even a plausible appearance of truth to the assertion that his was the doctrine of the Apostles; and upon what shall we found this early, this universal, this continued and uninterrupted custom? Shall we not take up the maxim of St. Augustin? What is taught every where by all persons, at all times, and not instituted by any council, must have been derived from the Apostles and through them from Christ. I shall not now insist upon the application of this principle. But I have destroyed that position of White's which Bishop Kemp and his associates undertook to defend, "That Tradition brought Purgatory to light about the time of the cessation of penitential discipline." I shall continue the examination of this subject.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XLII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 1, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I proceed to show from documents of others than Catholics, that the doctrine of the earliest ages of the Church was, 1. That there is a Purgatory: 2. That the souls therein detained may be aided by the prayers and suffrages of the faithful. Before I proceed it will be proper for me to lay down a few principles upon the application of which to the facts which I shall adduce, the conclusions will be properly drawn. First: when any number of persons separate from the Church, because of a difference in doctrine, and form a new society of their own, opposed to that from which they came out, neither division is disposed to adopt a new doctrine, or custom, for the purpose of gratifying the other: but each will be ready to proclaim aloud any innovation made by its opponent, and to reproach it with this new deviation from the ancient doctrine or practice delivered by Christ and his Apostles. Hence the silence of such parties where their opposition continues, and the opportunity of observation exists, together with the power of proclaiming the change, is strong presumptive evidence that no such change occurred: this will extend to observances apparently trifling and of no moment, and much more so to those which are important and essential; thus the Greek separatists amongst other things

objected to the Latin Priests and Bishops even the circumstances that they deviated from the Apostolic custom of wearing their beards.

Second: When the separatists who profess to cast off the errors of those from whom they departed, preserve any of the liturgy of the original body, and continue its use, and hold it in high esteem, they profess thereby that this portion of the liturgy is free from the alleged errors of the body from which the separation was made; and in like manner when they continue the observance of an ancient custom, it is a declaration that this custom is not founded upon error. Thus when the Methodists retain in Great Britain a portion of the articles and liturgy of the Established Church, and reject another portion, it is on their part, a testimony that the portion which they retain is in their opinion free from error.

Third: When at the period of separation, each division is zealous in the condemnation of the other, and both are agreed that a common doctrine or doctrinal custom has come to them from the proper source, which is Christ and his Apostles; they must be correct in their conclusion, or not sufficiently informed upon the subject: because the person who could show that the division to which he was zealously opposed held an erroneous doctrine as truth, would immediately proclaim the fact for the injury of those to injure whose system his zeal was burning. Hence the full agreement of both argues either the truth of the doctrine, or the ignorance of the believers.

Fourth: All the Churches of the East and West, Greeks, Latins, Armenians, Copts, Abyssinians, and so forth, could not have been so completely ignorant of the history of their Churches, of the testimony of their founders, of the doctrine of the Apostles, and of the meaning of the Gospel as to have in their liturgies, on their most solemn occasions, used prayers for the dead as an apostolic usage founded upon the doctrine of Christ; if such usage was not apostolic and founded upon that doctrine: because though we might suppose ignorance or corruption to have predominated in one or two of those divisions; yet common sense will forbid us to suppose it could have been spread so generally through them all as to involve them all in so gross and so general a delusion.

Fifth: The force of these principles will appear much more powerful and efficacious, when we multiply the obstacles to a collusion in error, by multiplying the divisions of Christians who having separated from the original Church were not only opposed to her, but also to each other: and in such a case the union of their testimony in favor of the truth and apostolic origin or sanction of any one of her doctrines

or doctrinal customs, must be the very strongest species of evidence in favor of her fidelity in preserving unchanged that which had been entrusted to her care.

Sixth: Allow me to add to these, the total inability of those persons who charge the Church with having introduced the doctrine at an intermediate period, to name the person by whom, the period when, or the place in which the introduction was made.

I shall now adduce some facts, which I leave to you as applicable to the principles just enumerated. I shall commence with the Church of England.

When Henry VIII separated that Church from the Catholic world, neither he nor his parliament nor his clergy, made any change in the doctrine or practice on this head. In the first edition of the *Common Prayer*, which was put forth under the reign of King Edward VI, after-some change of doctrine, still the following was retained in the Burial service:

Then the Priest casting earth upon the corpse, shall say, "I commend this soul to God the Father Almighty, and thy body to the ground, and so forth."

But as this commending of the soul was not suited to the new doctrine which was gradually introduced, that prayers for the dead were of no avail, so it was after a time disused, and the form now in use substituted.

Then while earth shall be cast upon the body by some standing by, the Priest shall say: "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God, of his great mercy to take unto himself the soul of our dear brother here departed, we therefore commit his body to the ground, Earth to Earth, and so forth."

Here we perceive the change of liturgy with the change of doctrine, but in order to accustom the people gradually to the change, the whole was not made at once, and therefore in the first book of Edward VI, we also find the following two prayers which were subsequently omitted, and were not in the amended *Common Prayer*:

Let us pray: "We commend into thy hands of mercy, (most merciful Father) the soul of this our brother departed, N. And his body we commit to the earth, beseeching thine infinite goodness to give us grace to live in thy fear and love, and to die in thy favor; that when the judgment shall come which thou hast committed to thy well beloved Son, both this our brother, and we, may be found acceptable in thy sight, and receiving that blessing which thy well beloved Son shall then pronounce to all that love and fear thee, saying, Come ye blessed children

of my Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you before the beginning of the world. Grant this merciful Father, for the honor of Jesus Christ our only Saviour, Mediator and Advocate. *Amen.*"

This prayer shall also be added: "Almighty God, we give thee hearty thanks for this thy servant, whom thou hast delivered from the miseries of this wretched world, from the body of death and all temptation: and as we trust, hast brought his soul, which he committed into thy hands, into sure consolation and rest: grant, we beseech thee, that at the day of judgment his soul, and all the souls of the elect departed out of this life, may with us, and we with them, fully receive the promises, and be made perfect altogether, through the glorious resurrection of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

And after the lesson from 1 *Corinthians* chapter xv, and the Lord's Prayer, the same book contained the following which the Common Prayer omitted:

Priest: "Enter not, O Lord, into judgment with thy servant."
Answer: "For in thy sight no living creature shall be justified."
Priest: "From the gates of hell."
Answer: "Deliver their souls, O Lord."
Priest: "I believe to see the goodness of the Lord."
Answer: "In the land of the living."
Priest: "O Lord, graciously hear my prayer."
Answer: "And let my cry come unto thee."

Let us pray: "O Lord, with whom do live the spirits of them that be dead, and in whom the souls of them that be elected, after they be delivered from the burthen of the flesh, be in joy and felicity; grant unto this servant, that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed unto him, but that he escaping the gates of hell, and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the region of light with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the place where is no weeping, sorrow nor heaviness, and when that dreadful day of the general resurrection shall come, make him to rise also with the just and righteous, and receive this body again to glory, then made pure and incorruptible; set him on the right hand of thy Son Jesus Christ, among thy holy and elect, that then he may hear with them these most sweet and comfortable words, Come ye blessed of my Father, possess the kingdom which had been prepared for you from the beginning of the world. Grant this, we beseech thee, O merciful Father, through Jesus Christ our Mediator and Redeemer. *Amen.*"

The same first book of Edward VI contained also a celebration of the holy eucharist, or holy communion, when there is a burial of the

dead; that the people might be gradually weaned from the Mass for the repose of the soul of the deceased. But though under Elizabeth the liturgy was changed, yet the clergy during her reign still took the Oblations and Doles or alms on behalf of the deceased, and L'Estrange tells us, that they used to receive the money in the reign of Charles I. I cannot say whether they do at present, but mortuary money is still by law a due to the Protestant Clergy of England.

In the second year of Elizabeth, the anniversary services for the repose of the souls of the benefactors of Eton and Winchester Colleges were converted into services of thanksgiving to God for their endowment.

The only additional change I believe, made by the Protestant Episcopal Church of America in the case, is the substitution of one Psalm for two.

Thus we perceive that a change of liturgy and a change of doctrine, as I have above expressed, go hand in hand. Thus when Henry VIII denied the Pope's supremacy, Bishop Burnet informs us regarding the *Mass-Book*, that the alterations were so small that there was no need of reprinting it; a few erasures of those collects in which the Pope was prayed for, the office of St. Thomas of Canterbury, (Becket) and of a few other saints with whom Henry was displeased, sufficed.

I now proceed to unchanged liturgies, and consequently to unaltered doctrines.

The Greeks who are separated from the universal communion have made their decisive separation at the time of Photius, in 867, although several attempts at reconciliation with the Roman Catholic Church have been occasionally made since that time. They generally acknowledge the Patriarch of Constantinople to be the head of their Church; though the Dukes and Czars of Muscovy, and Emperors of Russia, have succeeded latterly, in making the Russian portion of that body a separate Church, dependent upon themselves, still they use the same liturgy and follow generally the same practices, as their belief is the same.

The two principal liturgies used by the Greeks, who are subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople, are those of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom. There can be no doubt but St. Basil was the real author or the digester of the former; as to the second, it was ascribed to St. Chrysostom, only three hundred years after his death. It appears, that it is the ancient liturgy of the Church of Constantinople, which was called the *Liturgy of the Apostles* till the sixth century. The latter is used throughout the year, and contains the whole order of the Mass; the other, the prayers of which are longer, is used only on some par-

ticular days. There is a third, which is called the *Mass of the Presanctified,* because there is no consecration, as with us, on Good Friday; the priest does not consecrate, but communicates with the sacrament consecrated on Holy Thursday. The prayers of that Mass appear less ancient than those of the foregoing.

F. Le Brun has given the prayers and the order of the ceremonies of *St. John Chrysostom's Liturgy.* It is used in all the Greek Churches of the Ottoman Empire, which are subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and in those of Poland and Russia. As to the Greeks, who have Churches in Italy, they have made some alterations in that liturgy. The Patriarchs of Constantinople have even succeeded in getting it adopted in the patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria, by the Christian Melchites, who in the fifth century, rejected the Eutychain heresy. Although in all those countries the Greek language is not understood, yet the *Greek Liturgy* is universally followed; but on acdoing it explicitly. The Greeks have no distinct idea of what state of obliged to celebrate Mass in the Arabic language.

I have in my last letter shown that prayer for the dead is found in both those offices. I am aware that attempts have been made to persuade persons that the Greeks did not believe in the existence of Purgatory; and although I have before explained the difference between them and the Latins on this subject, I shall take this occasion of again doing it explicitly. The Greeks have no distinct idea of what state of suffering the soul undergoes, and some amongst them believe, that no soul goes to heaven before the period of the general resurrection: but they do believe that such souls as owe any thing to divine justice must have it expiated by suffering before the day of judgment, and they believe that prayers and suffrages will tend to this expiation, and therefore they do offer them for the relief of the deceased. In this they fully accord with the decision of the Council of Trent. "1. That there is a Purgatory." "2. That the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful." This is all which we are required to believe for faith: and this they firmly believe, and therefore preserve unchanged that service which they assert, as we agree, has come down to them from the Apostles. But some of the Latins are of the opinion that Purgatory is a special and definite place, and that the purgation is by fire. The Greeks say that this opinion is not well founded, and in saying this there is a difference of opinion, but no difference of faith between the Greek and Latin. Thus whilst the Greeks reproached the Latins with shaving their beards, refusing to ordain married men, consecrating in unleavened bread, fasting on Saturdays, eating milkmeats in the first week

of Lent, adding the particle *Filioque* to the creed, and so forth, they never charged them with error in praying for the dead, but they continue the prayer and the masses for the benefit of the deceased of their communion, and assert that in so doing, they only follow the maxims of the Gospel, and the injunctions of the Apostles.

The Eutychians were separated from the Church at the Council of Chalcedon, in the year 451, and a vast portion of Syria and Egypt embraced the errors of Eutyches. The ancient Egyptians had the liturgy in their own language, chiefly compiled from the offices of St. Mark, St. James and St. Cyril of Alexandria; this language is now known as the Coptic. The Syrians had that of St. James. The Eutychians in Syria and Egypt still use those same liturgies, unchanged in all that regards prayer for the dead; which they and the Catholics agree was found in the books, and used by their predecessors before the Council of Chalcedon, and which their fathers received as having come from the Apostles. Thus, although separated from the Church nearly fourteen centuries, they testify its belief upon this point as the day of their unfortunate secession.

The Armenians were drawn into the Eutychian heresy in the year 525, by James Baradœus, or Zanzales, [but] a great portion of them have returned to the Catholic communion: their liturgy was given to them by St. Gregory the Illuminator, in the 4th century, and both Catholics and Jacobites retain in it the prayers for the dead.

The Malabar Christians, or as they are sometimes called, "of St. Thomas," were discovered by the Portuguese in the beginning of the sixteenth century, and are a branch of the Nestorians. The following are extracts from their liturgy, which must correspond with that of the Chaldean Nestorians, subject to the Patriarch of Babylon, whom the Christians of St. Thomas looked upon as their head.

Prayers for the Dead: "Let us remember the faithful, our fathers and brethren, who departed from this world in the orthodox faith; let us, I say, beseech the Lord to absolve and forgive them their sins and transgressions, and make them worthy to rejoice, for ever, with the just and upright, who obeyed the will of God."

The Blessing of Masses for the dead: "Hear, O my Lord, the voice of my prayer, let our supplications come in before thee and receive our sacrifice and oblations, and be merciful to the sins of our brethren departed."

Nestorius was condemned in the Council of Ephesus in 431, and a large portion of the East, particularly Mesopotamia, and Persia embraced his errors.

The *Syrian Liturgy of St. James*, is that which is in general use amongst them, and they have always retained the prayers for the dead, and continue to use them.

Let us then look to this body of Christians separated during fourteen centuries from the Catholic Church, hating the Eutychians and hated by them, separated from the Greek Church, which they anathematize, and from the Latin Church, whose language they do not understand, from whose ceremonial they differ, and which they still proclaim as their unjust condemner: what but the strong evidence of well established truth can teach them an union of testimony. They produce their ancient records; they show a custom in which they were united before their differences originated; when their fathers held the doctrine delivered to them by the Apostles. Latin, Greek, Egyptian, Armenian, Syrian, Chaldean, Persian, Muscovite and Indian, Nestorian, Eutychian, Greek Catholic, schismatic and heretic, proclaim that the original liturgies which have been received from the Apostles, contain those prayers and suffrages which they desired should be offered for the benefit of the suffering dead: and with such a host of evidence as this before him, the Rev. Joseph Blanco White tells us that "Purgatory was brought to light by Tradition upon the cessation of canonical penance," and Bishop Kemp of Maryland, with a collection of every description of clergymen in his rear, proclaims to the Protestants of the United States, that they may rely upon the testimony of Blanco White! ! !

My friends, I have dwelt long upon this topic, but I must pursue it still farther, because I desire at least, upon one subject of doctrine, to afford our Right Reverend and reverend opponents a fair opportunity of defending White, if they can, and I have intentionally selected as a point for their assault, that which they generally proclaim to be the most foolish and absurd in our system, as they are pleased to call it. I shall therefore have to keep them to Purgatory for some time yet.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XLIII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 8, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—It is conceded by the most learned of our opponents, that the custom of praying for the dead is certainly as old as the second century of the Church, and the belief in the existence of purgatory is acknowledged by all persons to have been pretty general in the fourth century. I shall now proceed to show that our doctrine is that of the

New Testament. An ancient Christian writer stated, that to quote texts of Scripture for the purpose of proving any doctrine against heretics was, to say the least, useless, if not mischievous: for, added he, if they cannot by some ingenuity make the text by which they are condemned lose its force, they will deny its right to a place in the book, and, if necessary, will even deny the book which contains it to be canonical. When I state, then, that I will prove the doctrine of purgatory to be contained in the New Testament, I am very far from asserting that our adversaries will admit my proofs to be good: it would be unreasonable to expect this from persons who seriously assure us that the words "this is my body," mean "this is not my body," and that "the gates of hell shall never prevail against it," mean, "the gates of hell shall prevail against it," or who calmly assert that "whosesoever sins you shall remit are remitted to them," mean "whosesoever sins you shall remit, are not remitted to them." Thus I do not intend to create in you the hope that such persons will acknowledge the doctrine of purgatory to be contained in the New Testament: yet I assert that it is found in this divine book.

But why, it will be asked, will not their opinion, as to the meaning of a text, be of equal authority with mine? I admit the opinion of any one of them to be entitled to as much weight as is mine: but the question is not to be decided by either their opinion or by mine. The words of the sacred text have a precise and a determined meaning, intended by the Holy Ghost, and neither they nor I can make that meaning different from what it really is: and it is now the same that it was from the beginning, for the sense of the Holy Ghost continues unaltered and unalterable. This true meaning is the true doctrine or word of God, and it is what he designed to teach to man, and is frequently very different from that similitude of meaning which opponents can force upon words. St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, informs us how this true meaning is to be ascertained. This great man was born about the year 120, and was educated in the Christian doctrine by St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, a disciple of St. John the Evangelist, and was the senior of Irenæus by about 40 years. Irenæus also learned from Papias and other companions of the Apostles, and was himself styled by Tertullian "the most diligent searcher of all doctrines." In his *Works*, Book iv, chapter 63, we read:

"This recognition is the true doctrine of the Apostles, and the ancient state of the Church in the whole world, and the character of the body of Christ, according to the succession of the Bishops, to whom they delivered that Church which is in every place; which has come down

unto us, preserved without fiction, by the most full examination of the Scriptures, neither receiving addition nor diminution, and a reading without corruption, and a lawful and diligent exposition according to the Scriptures, both without danger and without blasphemy, and the chief gift of charity, which is more precious than the recognition, more glorious than prophecy, super-eminent above all gifts."

The true knowledge of the meaning of the sacred text is, according to this, to be found by the full explanation of the writing according to that ancient doctrine of the Apostles, recognised by the testimony of the general body of the successors of the Apostles in every place. One or two, a few might err; or they might give arbitrary and novel explanations, but the true meaning is recognised by the testimony of the whole body to whose care the text and its meaning were entrusted by the Apostles.

Theodoret, in his *Dialogue* 1, gives us the same principle:

"Those men were the successors of the Apostles, and some amongst them were accustomed to the enjoyment of their sacred and admirable presence, many of them have been adorned with the crowns of martyrdom. Does it then appear lawful for you to brandish your blasphemous and evil tongue against them."

I shall then, in explaining the passages of Scripture which I shall adduce, not give my own opinion, but the testimony of such men as those, to show the meaning; and hence it will not be the opinion of B. C. opposed to the opinion of any modern separatist, as to the true meaning of the text, but it will be the testimony of those ancient and venerable witnesses, from and through whom we have received the Scriptures themselves, as to the meaning of that sacred book of whose integrity and contents they are made the witnesses to us: and thus we do not interpret this venerable document by our own private judgment, but by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and we do not give our own private opinions, but the ancient, public testimony of the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles.

The first text is found in the Gospel of *St. Matthew*, chapter xii, 31, 32:

"Therefore I say to you: Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven men; but the blasphemy of the Spirit shall not be forgiven. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him: but he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come."

The early doctors and pastors of the Church, explaining this expression of our Saviour, repeatedly declare that its distinct meaning is,

that the sin which he so emphatically condemns, is one whose guilt and punishment will remain to eternity, and not be forgiven, either during man's mortal term, or after his death, in that new state of existence upon which he will enter, and in which many other sins of less heinous character are forgiven by the mercy of God, and by means of the prayers and suffrages of the Church and of her children. Amongst them are St. Augustine in his xxist book *Of the City of God*, chapter 24, and in his book vi against Julian, chapter 5; St. Gregory in his book iv of *Dialogues*, chapter 39; Venerable Bede on chapter iii of *Mark*. And when in the twelfth century the Petrobrusians denied the doctrine of purgatory and the use of praying for the dead, St. Bernard, in his Homily lxvi, on the Canticles, quoted this text as having been always an evidence of the doctrine, as did also Peter, the venerable abbot of Cluny, in his Epistle against them.

Another testimony of the New Testament is found in *Matthew*, chapter v, 25, 26, and *Luke*, chapter xii, 58, 59.

"And when thou goest with thy adversary to the prince, whilst thou art in the way endeavor to be delivered from him: lest perhaps he draw thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the exactor, and the exactor cast thee into prison. I say to thee, thou shalt not go out thence until thou pray the very last mite."

In the first of those places it is related that our Saviour used the expression in reference to the persons whom he charged to be reconciled with their enemies before they laid their gifts on the altar: in the second, he gives it as a sequel, to the admonition concerning the judgment which he must undergo before the tribunal of God. Several of the earliest fathers testify to us that it was understood regarding purgatory, from which the soul accused by the law of God, of venial sins or of incomplete satisfaction, would not come out before the divine justice had been satisfied. Amongst those are Tertullian, in his book *Of the Soul*, chapter xvii; St. Cyprian, Book iv, Ep. 2; Origen, Homily 35, *On Luke*; Eusebius, of Emessa, Homily 3, *On Epiphany*; St. Ambrose in his *Comment* on this paragraph in *Luke* xii; St. Jerom in chapter v, on *Matthew*.

In the fifth chapter of *Matthew* we also read the following passage:

"21. You have heard that it was said to them of old: Thou shalt not kill, and whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of the judgment. 22. But I say to you, that whosoever is angry with his brother, shall be in danger of the judgment. And whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council. And whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire."

Amongst other commentators, St. Augustine, Book i, chapter 19,

"On the Sermon on the Mountain," explains this passage as denoting three grades of punishment for sin after death, of which only the last was eternal, the other two temporary, or purgatory.

In the sixteenth chapter of the Gospel according to *St. Luke*, v. 9, we read:

"And I say unto you: Make unto you friends of the mammon of iniquity; that when you shall fail, they may receive you into everlasting dwellings."

The ancient writers, in this passage, understood that by the expression of the Saviour, "when you shall fail," he meant, "when you shall die," and by the words "friends" he meant the "saints," who themselves dwelt in the sacred abodes. Hence St. Ambrose, in his comment upon this passage, and St. Augustine, in his book xxi, *Of the City of God*, chapter 27, states the doctrine herein taught to be, that alms given to those who are holy, will be extremely profitable to the donor, as they being saints in heaven, will, after his death, aid him by their prayers: and from this very passage, St. Augustine takes occasion to state, that of those who die, some are very holy, and are immediately after death received into heaven, and can there by their prayers aid others; whilst some are so wicked, that after their death, they neither can aid or be aided; but are eternally lost: and finally that some are in that middle state, who, at the time of death, are not found deserving eternal punishment, nor sufficiently prepared for immediate admittance into heaven; and they are received into everlasting dwellings through the prayers of their friends.

In the second chapter of the *Acts of the Apostles*, verse 24, St. Peter says of our blessed Saviour:

"Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the sorrows of hell, as it was impossible that he should be holden by it."

I would not have quoted this passage were it not for the purpose of making a remark upon the difference of reading, and of the versions. I have quoted according to the Vulgate. The Greek copies have given occasion to a very curious exhibiton of this verse, "having loosed from the sorrows of death." It is clear the Saviour was not loosed therefrom, because he died upon the cross: and in the state subsequent to the pangs of death we know of no sorrow save that of hell, whether this expression means the place of eternal torments, or only a place of temporary pain. The body which lies in the grave feels no pain, has no sorrow. The ancient fathers, particularly Epiphanius and Augustine, who gave it, "loosed from the sorrows of hell," state that the pains of purgatory are meant, and not only that Christ was himself free from

their pain, as it was imposible he should be detained by it, but that on this occasion having gone as St. Peter stated in his Epistle, to preach to the spirits in prison, he released several who were enduring those pains. The Syriac copy corresponds with the Vulgate, and St. Polycarp and other very ancient authors use the same expressions, with us: the Greek is of very little, if any authority as an original, for it has not been preserved with sufficient care, or by sufficient witnesses: but this is not the place to enter upon such a question.

In the *First Epistle* of St. Paul *to the Corinthians*, chapter iii, we read the following passage commencing at the close of verse 9, and ending at the close of verse 15.

"You are God's building. According to the grace of God, that is given to me, as a wise architect, I have laid the foundation: and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation no man can lay but that which is laid: which is Christ Jesus. Now, if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble: every man's work shall be manifest, for the day of the Lord shall declare it, because it shall be revealed in fire: and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

The context, as well as the great body of ancient commentators, shows us the general sense of the passage to refer to the preachers and teachers of Corinth, where St. Paul laid the doctrine of Christ as the foundation for their labors: some of them, in pure sincerity of heart, raised a valuable superstructure by their exertions upon this foundation, and in the day of their appearing for judgment before the Lord, not only would their labors stand the scrutinizing fire of his judgment; but they should be rewarded. Some others, who continued indeed, faithful to the doctrine of truth, not leaving the foundation, raised upon it a superstructure in which there was much of vanity, the pride of human learning, vain philosophy, and other imperfections of our weak nature which could not endure the searching fire of God's judgment. They should, therefore, suffer loss of their labor, and would, as persons in a house which the fire was consuming, endeavor to escape; in this they should succeed, because they had not grievous offences to condemn them; they would be saved, but like persons escaping from a fire, having suffered loss and endured pain and affliction, which their more virtuous fellow ministers had escaped. That this endurance of theirs would be in the other world, after the judgment which succeeded their death, in

the day of the Lord, when their works would be tried, that it would also be temporary, and succeeded by salvation, which is our doctrine of purgatory, is then the meaning of the Holy Ghost in this passage of St. Paul: such was the belief of the Church in her earliest days, as is testified by St. Cyprian in an allusion which he makes to the text in Book iv, Epistle 2 to Antonianus; by St. Ambrose in his commentary upon this text, and in his *Sermon* 20, on *Psalm* cxviii; St. Jerom on Chapter iv, of the prophet Amos; St. Augustine in his *Explication of Psalm* xxxvii, and in a remark upon the text itself, and several others.

In the same epistle, chapter xv, 29, we read:

"Otherwise, what shall they do that are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not again at all? Why are they then baptized for them?"

Respecting this text, there is considerable difference concerning what is meant by the Apostle in these words "baptized for the dead." There was, about a century after his death, a custom of some Montanists, Marcionites, and Cerinthians, which was occasioned by the common usage of the Church, which they witnessed but turned to bad account. The orthodox friends of the deceased, prayed and made suffrages and alms on his account; frequently they placed those alms upon the grave, that the poor who there found relief might pray for the repose of his soul. The heretics above mentioned, not only did all this, but if the deceased died without baptism, they procured another to be baptized for him, and in his name, that he might obtain the benefit of the sacrament. But this error did not exist in the time of St. Paul, and therefore the allusion is not made thereto: besides, the Apostle writes in approbation of what he alludes to, and he would not approve of this error. The great body of commentators leads us to behold in the baptism which is here mentioned, one of those which St. Paul alludes to in the sixth chapter of his *Epistle to the Hebrews*, where he says:

"Wherefore leaving the word of the beginning of Christ, let us go on to things more perfect, not laying again the foundation of penance from dead works, and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and imposition of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."

In this place he speaks of baptisms in the plural number, whereas in his *Epistle to the Ephesians*, chapter iv, 5, he tells us "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." In this latter place he speaks of the sacrament which began then to be called baptism by excellence, and to which alone the name was soon applied, in such manner as that it is seldom given to any thing else. There were, however, several baptisms or purifications amongst the Jews; and there was the baptism of John the pre-

cursor of Christ, which was generally known as the baptism of penance, as being accompanied with those penitential exercises that were joined to repentance for sins in the Jewish nation: it is so called by St. Paul at Antioch, (*Acts* xiii, 24,) and at Ephesus (xix, 4.) Our blessed Saviour speaks of another sort of baptism, one of suffering, in *Mark* x, 38, 39:

"Can you drink of the chalice that I drink of, or be baptized with the baptism wherewith I am baptized? But they said to him: we can. And Jesus saith to them: you shall indeed drink of the chalice that I drink of: and with the baptism wherewith I am baptized, you shall be baptized."

And in *Luke* xii, 50:

"And I have a baptism wherewith I am to be baptized: and how am I straitened until it be accomplished?"

Thus we find three descriptions of baptism: that of washing; that of penance, to which the name was applicable whether it was accompanied with the purification or ablution with which the Jews generally accompanied and always concluded their penitential exercises [or not]; and that of suffering, which the Saviour came to undergo, and in which, several of his martyrs followed. Upon this view, "Baptism for the dead" means doing works of penance and prayer, to entreat mercy and pardon for the departed faithful. And the argument of St. Paul, is a proof of the belief in the resurrection exhibited by those who pray and do penance for the relief of the dead, which custom of penitential prayer for the dead, was common in the days of the Apostles, and as I shall hereafter show, in the days of our Saviour, and in the true Church before the coming of Christ. In this point of view, we have full evidence of the doctrine being contained in those passages which I have quoted, as it is in several others in the New Testament which I have omitted. I shall therefore in my next pass on to show that the evidence of this doctrine is contained in the Old Testament, and that it was one of the articles of true religion before the coming of the Saviour. Hence so far from having been brought to light by tradition at the time of the disuse of canonical penances, which was about seven, or eight, or ten centuries after the birth of our Saviour; I shall show that it was believed by the faithful, seven or eight or ten centuries before that period, and thence to the present day, as I have shown it to have been recognized, and alluded to by our blessed Lord and his Apostles; but it was no more necessary for the founder of the Christian law to have given a new revelation upon the subject, than to have given it upon the spir-

ituality and immortality of the human soul, which like the doctrine of purgatory, were known and believed during previous centuries.

I remain, yours, and so forth,

B. C.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

This book is due on the date indicated below, or at the expiration of a definite period after the date of borrowing, as provided by the library rules or by special arrangement with the Librarian in charge.

DATE BORROWED	DATE DUE	DATE BORROWED	DATE DUE
C28 (1149) 100M			

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
0035519029
BRITTLE DO NOT
PHOTOCOPY

936 En34
v.2